LIBRARY
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXVII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 28 NUMBER 1256

Europe Dances

There is no end to the European turmoil. Prime Minister Chamberlain, who is soon to visit Mussolini in furtherance of his unhappy "policy of appeasement" denies that he intends to cede British Somaliland or any other territory to Italy. He also denies that he contemplates an immediate grant of belligerent rights to the Spanish Rebels. Pathetically, he asks Hitler for "a sign" that he is ready to aid peace—a sign that certainly will not be forthcoming while the dictators continue to win so much for themselves by threatening war. Italy has closed down much of her machine-made propaganda for Tunis, Corsica and the French Riviera, but the claims have not been abandoned; they are all part of the bargaining process. A Ukrainian independence movement has bobbed up, obviously under German inspiration. Broadcasts in Ukrainian are being made from Czecho-Slovak radio stations, addressed to both the Ukrainians in Poland and those in the Soviet Union. A puppet "Tsar" has been brought forward as an excuse for German operations against Russia. A real storm center is Rumania; King Carol, who was rebuffed almost equally in London and Berlin, is trying to make up his mind in what camp he will be safest. Poland's newly announced friendship with Soviet Russia may be decisive in swinging him the same way.

Hutchins and Wall Street Reform

The latest reform era in the New York Stock Exchange has, like its predecessors, gone up in smoke. President Robert Hutchins of the University of Chicago in his letter of December 15 told the story. He had asked the new board of the Exchange, widely advertised as a reform group, to do something about the responsibility of the Stock Exchange members and firms whose concealment of Richard Whitney's embezzlement of Stock Exchange property made it possible for Whitney to continue in business and commit additional embezzlements. A member of the disciplinary committee of the Exchange knew many of the facts and kept silent. An ex-president and leading member of the Exchange commanded him to keep silence. A number of others, members of leading committees of the Exchange, suppressed the facts for the benefit not alone of Richard Whitney, but also of J. P. Morgan and Company, one of whose principal partners is Whitney's brother.

The New Republic in the article "It's the Same Old Wall Street" (August 24) recently demonstrated that the old guard and its friends are still in the saddle in the Stock Exchange and that many of the Board of Governors are dependent upon the favor of J. P. Morgan and Company for business. The article showed also that the very set-up of the new and so-called reform board perpetuates some of the worst evils attacked by Pecora in the banking investigation five years ago and by John T. Flynn in his book on "Stock Speculation." The action of this present Board of Governors on December 14 in voting unanimously, against the single vote by Robert Hutchins, to continue to be silent confirms all that The New Republic said. The public statement

CONTENTS

The Week 213

Editorials
- Where Housing Stands Today 216
- We Fight with Credits 217
- Showing Up Security 217

General Articles
- The Tory Dialectic: I . Frederick L. Schuman 220
- Automobiles of 1939 . . Dewey H. Palmer 222
- Watch France! . . . . Henri Lefebvre 226
- Offering for the Time Capsule (verse) . . . . . Kenneth Burke 226
- Shoot the Works . . . Heywood Broun 227
- Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 228
- Other People's Money . . John T. Flynn 229
- Ars Longa . . . . . Stark Young 230
- The Good with the Bad . . Otis Ferguson 231
- The Bandwagon 232
- A Communication . . . Phyllis Bottome 232

Correspondence 233

Books in Review
- Lord of These Elements . Malcolm Cowley 235
- Jim Farley: Soldier and Artist . Max Lerner 236
- Lest We Forget . . Robert Morss Lovett 238
- Capitalism on the Sickbed . Harvey J. Bresler 238
- New Books: A Reader's List 239

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1938, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49TH ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

issued by President Martin was a resort to obscurantism, arguing that it was not up to the Stock Exchange to duplicate the investigation conducted by the Securities and Exchange Commission. But Mr. Hutchins did not call on these quasi-reformers merely to investigate. He asked them to act.

Station WMCA and Father Coughlin

Station WMCA in New York City recently refused Father Coughlin his usual time on the air because he did not submit his script—as the practice of the station demands—in advance. The speech turned out to be the second of the "Jew-baiting" addresses which has aroused so much public indignation. WMCA probably would have refused its transmission had it seen the advance script, because of the racial conflicts it was likely to (and did) arouse. But the station, as it happens, cut off Father Coughlin because he did not comply with its routine requirements. Out of this incident a free-speech case has been manufactured by a group of organizations, including the Committee for the Defense of American Constitutional Rights, American Patriots, Inc., the Protestant War Veterans and the Protestant Chaplains' Association, along with many outraged Coughlinite followers. Mass meetings have been held and the station's studios picketed. And along with this campaign of "public indignation" the same organizations are conducting a boycott of the products of WMCA's leading advertisers. This protest derives its main impetus, however, not from Coughlinites but from the Protestant War Veterans—an opportunistic, "patriotic" society headed by Edward J. Smythe—and from American Patriots, Inc., commanded by Allen Zoll. The November 24 issue of Weckruf und Beobachter, organ of the local Nazi German-American Bund, contained a letter from the Protestant War Veterans thanking the paper for its coöperation in staging an "Americanism" rally. "Allen Zoll," it says, "asked me to go up to you or Fritz Kuhn and ask your coöperation; he told me you people had placed several thousand circulars for him." These are the people behind the attack on WMCA. There are Catholics, Coughlinites and Protestants participating, but the campaign is run by Zoll and his associates, "patriots" who are working with the Bund.

The Great Drug Mystery

The great McKesson and Robbins scandal sounds more like a conventional movie plot or the theme for a "who-dun-it" than anything in years. Here we have a vast drug house, old and venerated. Its president, Mr. F. Donald Coster, is a monument of respectability; he belongs to all the right clubs, is in "Who's Who in America," a tycoon who might easily have been on the front cover of Time. Then one of his employees begins to wonder why the warehouses for crude drugs are not insured. He investigates, discovers that there are no such warehouses, that there is only a mailing address.

With one foundation stone gone, the whole edifice topples. It is learned that the president and some of his associates have built a vast fabric of falsehood. A crude-drug business with assets of perhaps eighteen or twenty million dollars simply does not exist. The firm has been in the bootlegging business on a huge scale. There are reports, not yet verified but deserving the most thorough investigation, that it has been smuggling guns on an equally huge scale, presumably to the Spanish Rebels. The respected head of the house turns out to be somebody else, one Philip Musica. A quarter of a century ago he and his family engaged in a million-dollar swindle based, of all things, on false inventory records concerning imports of human hair. The ex-jailbird simply changed his name, as did several of his brothers, temporarily turned respectable, and then went ahead as bigger crooks than ever.

The story bristles with morals, of which we list merely a few. 1. This case seems to confirm the widely held theory that the bootleggers of prohibition days continued in the liquor business and control it at the present time. 2. It would be interesting to know why the insiders in Wall Street, tipped off about the story months ago, said nothing. 3. The controls of the SEC, instead of being too stringent, are apparently too lax and need tightening. 4. Why was it that government officials, warned about Coster-Musica years ago, ignored those warnings?

Hearst Keeps It Secret

Anthony Eden recently spent a week in this country. We announce this news with a little trepidation, since to do so is against the wishes of the mighty Mr. Hearst. Not long ago an order was sent to all his editors. It said (as quoted by The Guild Reporter):

> No paper must give any publicity to what Mr. Eden says. The Chief says: "I think Eden's impudence is only equaled by his lack of vision. We must keep rid of him."

Had you already heard that Eden was in America? If so, that just proves that even Mr. Hearst is not so powerful as he thinks he is. Not quite.

Wearing Black for Hitler

If we were Hitler we should think very seriously about what happened a few days ago in Santiago, Cuba. A Nazi school ship was in port and the 500 cadets and officers came ashore assuming that they would get a cordial welcome—since the Batista government until recently at any rate, has been most friendly to the German regime. Instead, they walked between a double rank of 30,000 Cuban workers, extending from the docks far along the route of march. Each of the 30,000, as he stood silent with folded arms, wore a black ribbon in his coat lapel—a mourning ribbon for civilization, killed in Germany by Hitler and his crew. These 30,-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

000 Cuban workmen may have started something that will spread a long way. If millions of persons all over the world should begin to wear a black ribbon, or an arm or hat band, for the same reason, even Dr. Goebbels would be hard put to it to explain the whole thing as "just another Jewish-Bolshevist plot."

Oregon and the Unions

Oregon's anti-labor initiative law, which was passed in the fall elections, has plunged the state into hot water. Like most other legislation with the same purpose, the Oregon statute defines the justifiable activities of unions so narrowly that it virtually destroys their excuse for being. It limits strikes, for example, which would interfere with manufacturing or marketing; but a strike which has no effect on the employer's business is just as good as no strike at all. Organized labor in the state is fighting hard against the law. The AF of L and the CIO, ignoring for the time being their own differences, have jointly appealed to the Social Security Board to refrain from certifying the Oregon Unemployment Compensation Act because, they argue, the anti-labor initiative has disqualified Oregon from its right to federal grants under the terms of the Social Security Act. If the Board agrees to labor's argument it will mean, specifically, that a $5,000,000 tax-credit offset on payments made to the federal government by Oregon employers will not be granted. The usual procedure of the government is to turn back this 90 percent of employers' social-security taxes plus certain additional sums for administration costs. The Social Security Board's decision is anxiously awaited. If the CIO and the AF of L win their point, unionism will have won a valuable and, in our opinion, justifiable victory. Oregon's anti-labor law contradicts the purpose of many important New Deal laws. If the state is unwilling to accept the federal viewpoint on labor unions and labor's rights, it has no reason to expect federal social-security benefits.

Another Try at the Parking Problem

The parking problem continues to be one of the most serious confronting American cities. About sixty of them have solved it by use of parking meters which clear up their most congested areas, but are of course a palliative and not a cure. Another attack on the same situation has been reported by the American Society of Planning Officials. In the past three years thirty-three American cities have established municipally owned and operated parking lots, some of which are of great size: Chicago cares for 3,500 cars, Memphis 3,000 and Racine, Wisconsin, "an unlimited number." Eight more communities are about to be added to the list. Many cities have bought expensive land for this purpose. The interesting point is that thirty-one of the thirty-three make no charge for the use of the parking lot. By doing away with attendants and gates they cut the cost of operation to almost nothing. The doctrine will seem as startling to many people as does the suggestion of free street-car transportation (although everyone is accustomed to free elevator service in skyscrapers). Nevertheless the overwhelming vote of American municipalities clearly is that an automobile at rest is just as much a municipal obligation as one in motion. Which sounds like good sense.

Mickey in Spain

Mussolini has banished Mickey Mouse from Italy; but news of this has evidently not penetrated to all the parts of the world where his countrymen are engaged in deeds of valor Italian style. A book recently published in Rome carries a photograph of an Italian bomber in Spain which has Mickey painted heroic size on the fuselage. This, we submit, is as it should be. What more appropriate than to drop bombs on infants from an airplane carrying the pictured image of Mickey, beloved friend of children around the world?

Blocked Marks

A friend of ours who knows about military affairs followed carefully the recent trial of the German spies in New York. He tells us that practically all that the Nazis learned by spending thousands of dollars on espionage they could have acquired by buying the right documents from the Government Printing Office. Total cost: $4.33.

"The Puritan" Is Censored

New York State has imposed the censor's ban on a new French movie, "The Puritan," adapted from the novel by Liam O'Flaherty and produced under his supervision. The censors objected on the grounds that the picture is "immoral, irreligious, inhumane and tends to incite crime"—almost everything that a movie mustn't be. We saw "The Puritan" at a private preview and it is a brilliant job. It tells the story of a fanatical young man, a member of a Catholic vigilante society, who believes his job is to purge the world of wickedness. His society burns "immoral" books and fights the corrupt press, and the young Puritan, partly out of moral conviction and partly for human jealousy, murders the prostitute who lives on the floor below in his *pension*. But unfortunately, in telling the story of the murder and in tracing out its impact on the young man's mind, "The Puritan" inevitably runs afoul of most of the taboos of New York State. The censorship is being reconsidered by the New York Board of Regents and the American Civil Liberties Union urges you to write and ask that the movie be shown. It should be released, at least to adult audiences, because it is as good as the best pictures New York has seen this winter. Under the existing laws, however, the chances that it will be played commercially are slim. A girl wearing too few clothes is censorable, whatever the movie's pur-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pose and whatever the effect of the scene, derived from the story's total context, may be. If the Regents uphold the ban, they may be acting in complete accord with the law. But if "The Puritan" cannot be seen by New York's adult movie patrons, that law needs change.

News Notes of a Week

In the Lima Conference, little progress was made. The Argentine Republic was the chief opponent of the proposal, fostered by the United States, for a "declaration of solidarity" in this hemisphere. Secretary Hull discouraged suggestions from Latin America for an effort to mediate the Spanish conflict. . . . The United States sent another stiff note to Germany regarding application of anti-Semitic laws to American citizens, as Italy gave assurances that rights of United States nationals under similar conditions would be protected. . . . In Hungary it was predicted that the Jewish participation in business and the professions would be cut down from 20 percent to 6. Rumania sounded out Great Britain and France on accepting 150,000 Rumanian Jews in their colonies. . . . In the wars in China and Spain there were no developments of importance.

John L. Lewis indicated that the CIO would seek to support the Democratic Party in 1940, rather than any new political organization. . . . Francis J. Gorman, president of the United Textile Workers, staged a revolt against the Textile Workers' Organizing Committee. . . . The so-called monopoly committee continued its investigation, which centered this week on the glass-bottle trade.

Where Housing Stands Today

THE UNITED STATES HOUSING AUTHORITY has lately come in for a series of violent attacks. Several newspaper and magazine articles have appeared, so closely together as to suggest collusion, criticizing the record of the USHA and attacking its personnel. To be sure, these critics no longer dare to fight the principle of public aid to housing, as most of them would have done a few years ago. They now agree that public housing is desirable in theory; but by an odd coincidence they attack everything that is being done to bring it into existence. Their charges are serious if true. The question is whether they are true.

The United States Housing Authority, we should remember, does not go out and build homes for the poor. It aids local officials in doing so. When it began work about a year ago, many states lacked even the enabling legislation to permit cities to go to work. In a great majority of the communities, housing authorities did not exist, and the community did not know how to get started. There was almost complete ignorance of the many and complicated matters involved in buying land, demolishing slums and building new houses.

In a year's time, the USHA has earmarked $650,000,000, all the money it can loan at present, with many additional applications necessarily rejected or postponed. The total amount authorized for loans was $800,000,000, but the $28,000,000 limitation on contracts for annual contributions, and the necessity for allowing for contingencies, have reduced the amount available for earmarking by $150,000,000. The funds already earmarked will provide new homes for not less than half a million people.

Earmarking means that a local housing authority has been created, that the city government is prepared to help, and that the program has been outlined in a satisfactory way. Earmarkings cover 155 local authorities in twenty-nine states, plus the District of Columbia, Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

Of this total, about one half—or $320,986,000 represents loan contracts that have been approved by the President. They embrace 140 projects in 75 communities, to rehouse about 64,450 families. Loan contracts mean that suitable sites have been selected, detailed programs completed, the local 10 percent of the financing has been found and the city government has agreed on all necessary points.

Construction contracts have been let or advertised on fifteen projects in thirteen cities to provide housing for 9,789 units. From now on, about 5,000 family units will be started each month.

On all this work, three points have been kept in view: low rents, low construction costs, and the maximum amount of local responsibility. Speed could have been greatly increased if any of these three ideals had been abandoned, but the harm to the whole idea of public housing in that case would have been very great. The contribution of the local authorities has been one of great importance, particularly in helping to hold down operating costs. These are a complicated matter, in which charges for utilities and the cost of insurance are a vital factor. Progress has already been made.

Of the housing thus far planned, about one-half has involved slum clearance and the other half has been on vacant land in the outskirts of the community. The lay public always associates housing with the demolition of slums, with an enthusiasm which the experts do not share. They feel that a given amount of money will usually go farther in providing new homes if not spent in the congested area where (especially in the largest cities) land values are so high. The chief immediate point is that there is a grave shortage of housing all over the United States. If you tear down a slum and replace it with living quarters for the same or a smaller number of persons, you have not bettered the shortage; you may even have made it worse.

Any unprejudiced person, we think, must agree on the face of the facts that the USHA has done a good job in the short time it has been in existence. It has not, however, solved the housing problem in the United

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States. Today there are 5,000,000 families or more who are living "doubled up" with someone else. There are another 3,000,000 families who live in substandard housing, even under the narrowest interpretation of that phrase. There is a tremendous job still to be done and the USHA ought to be allowed to do it. The next Congress should increase the United States Housing Authority's lending program by at least an additional $1,000,000,000, remembering that this money is an investment, and one of the safest in the world. It is also essential that Congress should authorize the United States Housing Authority to enter into additional contracts for annual contributions up to at least $50,000,000. This would make it possible to carry out both the remainder of the present program and the entire new program suggested. Minor amendments might be proposed, but the fact is that one year has demonstrated the United States Housing Act to be a workable mechanism and a sound framework on which to build a long-term housing program.

We Fight with Credits

PARTISANS OF CHINA will be glad that the United States government is extending financial help to her. It is doing so in two ways. One is a credit of $25,000,000 from the Export-Import Bank, said to be intended to facilitate exports to China of "agricultural machinery and manufactures," and imports from her of wood oil. The other is a renewal of credit against gold held by China in this country—a reserve built up since 1936 by the sale of silver to the United States government. The value of this gold is said to amount to about $100,000,000. The credit in question is capable of indefinite expansion, since our government is continuing to buy silver and can decide how large a credit the gold reserve will warrant.

Great Britain is reported at the same time to be lending money to China. Both credits come at a time when the new road from Burma, at present inaccessible to the Japanese, is being finished. Over this road, it is expected, will come munitions and needed supplies to enable the Chinese to continue their resistance. The announcement of the credits also comes at the moment when Japan has declared that she has slammed shut the "Open Door." Japan naturally objects, and warns that action of this kind will not improve relations between her and the other two powers.

We are glad that China is getting help, and hope it will do her some good in her resistance to Japanese aggression. But there are aspects of the affair that are cause for concern. Our assistance to China comes in the process of a quarrel, not about investment v. imperialism, but about trading and investment rights in China. The Department of State, in supporting its traditional "Open Door," and in its many complaints to the Japanese government, is not acting on the basis of broad principle or a well considered peace policy, but merely to protect American business abroad. Furthermore, it is acting contrary to the expressed will of Congress. The Neutrality Act, which forbids credits to belligerents, was intended to be applied in the event of any major war. The President ignored it in this case.

We should be more inclined to credit the administration with high and useful intentions in this instance if it were not for its activities in others. If no embargo is declared in the Far East, why the embargo against Spain, where democracy and fascism clearly are at grips? And if business and financial motives do not largely govern our foreign affairs, why do our diplomatic representatives at Lima refuse to write the "good-neighbor policy" into international law by a treaty which would outlaw the use of force or diplomatic pressure in behalf of American financial interests in Latin America? In view of this refusal—made at the very time when British and American oil interests are trying to embroil us with Mexico—what will the Latin Americans think of the action of the Export-Import Bank in extending further credits for American investment to the south? Will they think we are really concerned about protecting democracy or about building a business empire?

There is something about the complete separation of American foreign policy from democratic control that smells of danger. Here we go lending money about the world in pursuit of political aims based on business interests, making enemies and friends among nations, and all without any advance knowledge or expressed will on the part of the people or their legislative representatives. Maybe our government ought to plunge in and help China defeat Japan, at whatever risk in the way of Japan's resentment. Maybe it ought to do a lot of things. But let's have broad-gauge foreign policy, under some popular control. Let's know more about what the high-hat boys in the foreign service are doing, and why.

Shoring Up Security

THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SOCIAL SECURITY in its recommendations for modification in the Social Security Act has taken a step in the right direction, but not a very long one. What were the principal defects in the Act as passed? We may briefly list them as follows:

1. The benefits were not large enough for those who really needed old-age pensions, and they left out important occupations.

2. The burden of the taxes assessed to pay the benefits fell almost entirely on the lower-income groups and thus reduced purchasing power and constituted a depressing influence. These taxes were, moreover, much greater than necessary because it was mistakenly believed that an enormous reserve had to be built up as in private insurance.

3. The burden of record-keeping forced upon employers

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the Act was too heavy because of the unnecessary complications in the scheme.

On the first point, the Advisory Committee has done the obvious thing by recommending the inclusion of 2,000,000 employees of non-profit religious, charitable and educational institutions (exclusive of public employees), 400,000 seamen and 400,000 employees of banks. Later on, farm employees and domestics may be added. Pensions paid would also be increased in the earlier years of the scheme, when, under the present system, accumulations of contributions would be so small as to yield a mere pittance. Additional payments would also be made for dependent wives, and payments to surviving wives and children were recommended. Thus the law would take into account the relative needs of the aged, as well as actuarial considerations.

On the second point, the Council has put its finger on the worst omission in the original Act by recommending that the federal government bear one-third of the cost out of general funds, instead of levying it all on payroll contributions by employers and employees as at present. What is the virtue of this change? The money paid to the aged and the unemployed has to come from somewhere. The difference is, however, that some ways of raising it may levy it on the very income classes that the legislation is designed to help, or may tend to restrict production and so make all of us poorer. Both defects characterize the present payroll taxes. Part comes from the wage-earner himself and so restricts popular purchasing power. Part is paid by the employer, as a percentage of wage payments; this is added to costs of production and so tends to increase the price of the manufactured products and to restrict output and employment. But if the federal government shoulders the cost directly it can (and does to a large extent) raise the money by taxes on income and profits, graduated according to ability to pay. Such taxes bear less heavily on the poor and do not increase costs of production or prices. Furthermore, the government could, in time of depression, meet its share by borrowing and thus avoid the deflationary influence of the present procedure.

Even so, the larger benefits contemplated could not be met if the intention remained, as at present, to build up huge reserves against future needs. The Council therefore recommends, not that the present reserve be dissipated or the present payroll taxes be reduced, but rather that they be not allowed to rise after 1940, as the law would require. The larger benefits would then prevent the accumulation of an unwieldy reserve.

On the third point, the Council is disappointingly silent. The immense confusion caused by the lack of integration of the various schemes in the original law remains unraveled. Employers are obliged to keep exhaustive records and separate accounts for old-age-security payments, unemployment-insurance taxes to the states, unemployment-insurance taxes to the federal government, and many other governmental requirements. The bother and expense of all this paper work creates more resentment against the laws, especially among small business men, than the payment of the taxes themselves. It may even have had a good deal to do with the shift of sentiment against the administration in middle-income groups at the last election. If the government had in the first place adopted a straight federal scheme for unemployment insurance instead of the confusing plan of grants-in-aid to the states, much of the present unworkable red tape would have been avoided. It would then have been possible to consolidate the record-keeping for the various kinds of social insurance. Some change in this direction will be imperative in the future, especially if health insurance is to be added.

We are of course many years from the possibility of having a really simple and logical plan for social security—and we may never have one. Such a plan would be adjusted to all the needs of the individual. It would necessitate only a minimum number of records for each person, whether his requirement happened to be for unemployment compensation, old-age insurance, health indemnity or something else. It would be based on a universal and well ordered system of public employment exchanges and a system of clinics combining supervision of health and social welfare. The financing would be taken care of entirely by the government, except for such individual contributions from the participants as would be desirable for the sake of maintaining a sense of personal responsibility. The government in turn would raise the necessary funds on the basis of a fiscal and taxing policy directed toward maximizing and stabilizing production, instead of attempting to imitate the meaningless financial ritual of private insurance companies. Measured against such an ideal, the report of the Advisory Council marks only a small advance.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

Editors

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

Assistant Editors: OTIS FERGUSON ELIZABETH HULING

Contributing Editors

H. N. BRAILSFORD HEYWOOD BROUN JOHN T. FLYNN
WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN. W. P. MANGOLD
JON. MITCHELL LEWIS MUMFORD R. G. TUGWELL

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

E. G. WOOD *Advertising Manager*
BYRON DEXTER *Circulation Manager*

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Tory Dialectic: I

THE FOREIGN POLICY of Britain's National Government since 1931 has been a mystery to most beholders. Mr. Stimson was mystified by Sir John Simon's refusal to respond to American proposals for joint action against Japan. During the ensuing years Downing Street has yielded the hegemony of Eastern Asia to Tokyo, the mastery of the Continent to Germany and control of East Africa and the middle Mediterranean to Italy. Each year the mystery has deepened, for each year British power and prestige have sunk to lower depths. The power of Britain's potential enemies has come closer each year to the point at which the equilibrium is irretrievably upset and Britain is dealing with rivals at once more powerful than the Empire and hungry for imperial riches. With this point now reached, policy at Whitehall exhibits no change. Now as before every effort is made to assist or condone the aggrandizements of the Fascist Triplice and to subvert all attempts on the part of their victims or rivals to offer collective resistance. *Cui bono?*

Mystification is a product of a patent discrepancy between observers' expectations and observed performance. Observers have brought to the problem various stereotyped evaluations and anticipations flowing from past experience and long useful as a means of apprehending the meaning of British conduct in world politics. They have discovered in the problem a sequence of decisions and consequences so utterly at variance with expectations as to induce bewilderment.

The frustrated expectations which are most widespread are the residue of several centuries of British diplomacy. Governments in relation to other governments, argue the commentators, pursue self-interest. The major interests of the British ruling classes have long been commerce, colonies and sea power. They require a policy of thwarting every effort by any rival power to establish itself so securely in Europe, Africa or Asia as to jeopardize British markets, communications and bases. Hence the captains and the kings of England have pursued a "balance-of-power" program involving the support of the weak against the strong so that no power might impose its will on all others. From William of Orange to Curzon, from Elizabeth and Anne to the Georges, from Sir Robert Walpole to Sir Edward Grey, and indeed from Cardinal Wolsey to Winston Churchill, Britain fought and halted all aspirants to universal dominion, among them Louis XIV, Napoleon I and Wilhelm II. But in the fourth decade of the twentieth century all this is apparently abandoned, for Downing Street not only sets no discernible limits to the ambitions of Hirohito, Hitler and Mussolini, but forbids others to set such limits. An alleged customary solicitude for "freedom," "democracy" and "toleration" is likewise abandoned. Those with different sets of expectations arrive at futility by a different route, but in most instances the quality of bewilderment is the same. What new assumptions as to motives can be made to explain so obvious a departure from the accumulated wisdom of the past?

The problem here raised is a fascinating study in semantics, behaviorism and psychiatry. It cannot here be explored in all its myriad ramifications. Any effort to formulate a pattern of words which will name accurately (and therefore "explain") the complex phenomena under observation must fail of its purpose if the words are simple labels and must, if successful, be equivalent to a cultural history of modern England—a task outside the limits of the present enterprise. Simple formulas are untruths or half-truths, because they blind the observer to much of the pertinent data.

The diagnosis here advanced is that the mystery of Tory Britain, with all allowances for unique local characteristics, is but another instance of a widespread behavior-phenomenon in Western Europe in the age of its cultural decay. In its consistency, persistence and universality, that phenomenon approaches the cosmic majesty of Destiny, Fate or Nemesis. As data of social science, it may be variously described in the various current vocabularies.

In the terminology of Marx: ruling classes threatened with expropriation create and employ instruments of violence which are intended to protect the power and privileges accruing from their established control of the instruments of production. If the organizers of violence perform their assigned task, the ruling classes are saved. But if they turn upon their patrons, the ruling classes may be destroyed by their own protectors, particularly when they are caught in a web of insoluble social and economic contradictions. In the terminology of Pareto: economic élites menaced by counter-élites from the social sub-strata employ military élites to safeguard their status at the apex of the social hierarchy. But if the military élites usurp the positions of the economic élites they are called upon to defend, this mode of defense proves fatal. In the terminology of Ivan Pavlov and John B. Watson: organisms give negative responses of fear or rage (*i.e.*, tropisms of withdrawal or hostile approach) to environmental threats against the affective symbols to which they have been positively conditioned. They achieve adjustments either by modifying their own symbol-systems and habit-patterns, by fleeing from or destroying the sources of danger or, when neither of these adjustments is possible (as in the present case), by relying upon others to cope with the threats. But if the others switch signals and indulge in negative or destructive overt behavior

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against those threatened instead of against the threateners, the adjustment becomes objectively futile (however subjectively satisfying it may be) and the original organisms perish. In the terminology of Freud: personalities afflicted with anxiety by virtue of internal conflicts induced by external danger project their aggressions onto external objects. Such aggressions are violent in proportion as they are denied verbal expression or repressed below the level of consciousness. Such projections, when followed by overtly hostile acts, gratify hitherto repressed *id*-impulses in a fashion socially approved and satisfying to the *ego*, and therefore acceptable to conscience, *i. e.*, *super-ego* restraints. When inhibitions or circumstantial obstacles thwart such overt discharge of aggressions, vicarious discharge may be achieved by encouraging others to attack the hated object. But if the aggressions of others are turned backward upon the instigators, the result is disastrous both subjectively and objectively.

These varying formulations attempt to indicate motivations, describe conduct and suggest risks. The process may appropriately be stated at greater length in less technical language. The rulers of Britain, like all nobilities, plutocracies and priesthoods in the anxious middle decades of the twentieth century, live under the shadow of a great fear: social revolution from below which would seek to abolish nobilities, plutocracies and priesthoods. They therefore view with alarm all propensities on the part of the lower social orders to limit or assail the privileges of their superiors, whether in the name of democracy, socialism, syndicalism, communism, "Peoples' Front" or merely "Social Democracy" or "Labor." They view with approval all devices which promote "order, hierarchy, discipline" and cause the masses to respect and obey the classes.

Britain's oligarchy is not objectively menaced by domestic proletarian unrest. The Labor Party is no threat, for its leaders can be counted upon to disown their alleged aims in a crisis, as in the General Strike of 1926 and the panic of 1931. The elaborate paraphernalia employed by Fascist regimes to deflect mass resentments into safe channels and to evoke mass respect and obedience is therefore not required in a society in which the masses have never challenged their betters for the past three centuries. The symbols of monarchy, nobility, property and religion are as efficacious as ever in eliciting loyalty from the common man, whatever his deprivations or insecurities. But the oligarchy suffers from subjective insecurities which magnify alleged dangers to its position. Its wealth and power, moreover, rest ultimately upon worldwide empire. That empire is potentially menaced—in Africa, the Near and Middle East, in India and in China—by an old imperial rival which is now a new class enemy. This enemy is consecrated in word and deed to the ultimate destruction of the patterns of inter-class, inter-racial and international relations of which the oligarchy is the beneficiary. This enemy, moreover, rules the largest, most populous and potentially most powerful of the Great Powers. The "bear who walks like a man" is now the master of the "Socialist Fatherland" which challenges all aristocracy, all capitalism, all imperialism. The oligarchy is not shortsighted even if its inner doubts cause it to magnify the danger. It correctly envisages the USSR and the Comintern as the most menacing of all threats to its values and its way of life—even though the recognition is at times unconscious and open acknowledgment of it is rare.

The destruction of the Soviet counter-élite has been a constant object of the oligarchy since 1917. The first effort (1918-20) failed. Unsuccessful intervention and blockade were followed by "peace" and a *modus vivendi*. Subsequently there came to power at Rome, Tokyo and Berlin regimes sworn to defend "civilization" (*i. e.*, other oligarchies) against "Bolshevism." These regimes also threatened the Empire. And their domestic methods, while admirably effective, were ungentlemanly. Nevertheless, in word and deed, they threatened Moscow first. But their threats to Moscow could not be implemented unless they acquired the economic and military means for launching their projected crusade. Since the USSR is vast, amorphous and potent, the war-lords of Japan could not challenge it to battle unless they first had in their hands Manchuria and most of China. They must, therefore, be permitted to "save China from Bolshevism" and, if need be, acquire hegemony over Eastern Asia. For similar reasons the Third Reich could not move eastward against the menace without first obtaining mastery of Central Europe. Fascist Italy, moreover, must be strengthened in Africa and the Mediterranean as a useful ally.

The exigencies of this logic lead to certain obvious conclusions in diplomacy and strategy which are not products of muddling, stupidity or weakness but of simple *Realpolitik*. They did not emerge all at once, like Minerva from the brow of Jove, nor have they been acted upon with perfect consistency. Their content shifts with changing circumstances. They spring not from any group of "conspirators," but rather from the progressive adaptation of accepted assumptions to the unfolding problem. Once the first steps were taken, other steps followed and the shape of the destination has become clear with a cold hard logic of its own.

The USSR must be isolated. The ties between France and her Eastern allies must be broken. France must be immobilized, for any French involvement in the clash to come would, for geographical reasons, entail British involvement—which is precisely what is to be avoided. The immobilization of France requires the strengthening of Germany and Italy to a point at which Paris cannot challenge them. Hence remilitarization of the Rhineland, threats to French communications in the Mediterranean and Fascist victory in Spain

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were all useful devices to supplement British efforts to keep France neutral. A neutralized France must be induced to grant Hitler *carte blanche* in Danubia, Balkania and the East. By the same logic Italy must be helped to checkmate France and Japan must be permitted to impose her will on China. Hence all efforts from Geneva, Paris or Washington to thwart the march of the anti-Comintern crusaders must be sabotaged. In the end the Fascist Triplice must attack the USSR and the Western Powers must remain neutral. The oligarchy and the Empire will thereby be saved, for communism cannot defeat such a combination of foes. It will either be driven back to the Urals or will, by desperate resistance, exhaust itself and its enemies alike to the advantage of British interests.

This program can never be openly acknowledged by Tory officialdom because the masses whom the oligarchy rules (and even some members of the oligarchy itself) have unfortunately been conditioned to respond favorably to such shibboleths as "indivisible peace," "collective security" and "League of Nations." The problem here is one of winning elections at home by the adroit manipulation of such popular slogans without permitting them to achieve any implementation abroad. The electorate, moreover, must be kept from disillusionment and induced to support the program without being aware of its purposes or implications. In this supreme test of political skill, the oligarchs have not been found wanting. Mass fear of "war" and mass attachment to "peace," "facts," "compromise," "realism," "coöperation," "friendly relations" and "general appeasement" have been utilized to evoke approval for policies designed to smash "indivisible peace," "collective security" and "League of Nations." The trick has been neatly turned by consistent employment of the necessary stereotypes to disguise the import and direction of the course embarked upon.

A variety of other motivations strengthens the decision. The course, despite its difficulties, is essentially one of inertia. Inertia is always easier than action. The Russian Revolution, like the French Revolution, represents Atheism, Immorality, Murder and Theft. The Tories of Chamberlain look upon it much as Edmund Burke viewed the France of 1793. They stand for Religion, Morality and Property. These values fascism is sworn to protect. The new course, moreover, involves an arms race. Many of the oligarchs hold stock in arms companies. To use public funds for private enrichment is not immoral by their code, provided the funds go for "national defense." The corporation of which Chamberlain himself was at one time director, the Birmingham Small Arms Company, once handled all British army contracts. The unacknowledged slogan of the new day is: billions for defense, not one penny for collective security. By 1938 the budget of the three defense departments, plus costs of air-raid precautions, had climbed to £283,500,000. It is planned to spend on defense during the next five years more than £1,500,000,000. Such expenditure helps to reduce unemployment and restore national prosperity. The stockholders in companies producing arms, munitions, aircraft and ships are not averse to serving the nation in this fashion. They include many aristocrats and numerous dignitaries of State and Church.

The course itself is not without its dangers. It is irrevocable, for if the Caesars are granted mastery of Europe and Asia, such mastery cannot later be taken from them. Should they ultimately utilize their power not to attack the USSR, but to wrest concessions from London and Paris or, *horribile dictu*, to inaugurate the partition of the established colonial empires, their demands will have to be met or a new course of costly and dubious resistance will have to be embarked upon. Hence the necessity for more and more armaments. Even in this unhappy eventuality, however, there is still a margin of safety. The colonial possessions of Belgium, Portugal, the Netherlands and even France can be utilized to appease Fascist hunger, for these states are no longer in a position to defend themselves. If the Empire should itself be hard pressed, reliance must be put on Anglo-American solidarity. This last defense is based upon no wishful assumption of American folly, but upon the realistic premise that the United States, for its own security, cannot afford to permit the Fascist Triplice to smash the Empire.

There are other risks. Should the Triplice attack the USSR and win, it might achieve invincibility and then turn against the Empire. Should the Triplice attack the USSR and lose, Moscow might spread communism over Europe and Asia and inevitably attack the oligarchy and emancipate its subject peoples. In this case American aid would be indispensable for salvation. Should Moscow and the Triplice by some improbable miracle come to terms and make common cause, all may be lost. These risks are of such a character that the gamble may prove fatal. But the oligarchy is unable or unwilling to adopt any alternative course.

In the playing of the game another consideration of crucial import dominates every move. This too flows from the premises. The gangsters must not be permitted to destroy themselves. Should they attack Moscow prematurely, should they launch aggression against other states under circumstances in which a great coalition against them might emerge, should they face defeat in any war, it would be imperative for Downing Street to rescue them. Rescue might prove difficult. They must therefore not be allowed to run needless risks. Others must not be allowed to oppose them effectively. If they accomplished their own destruction, they would not only become useless for protection against Moscow but they would open the door wide to World Revolution. In that event the entire gamble would be lost, for Fascist defeat might well mean Com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

munist victory in Japan, Italy and Germany alike. Consequently the rescuers must repeatedly be rescued from their own rashness. Even if they become enemies of Britain, they must still be rescued—for their defeat would mean the victory of an enemy far more dangerous and formidable.

This dilemma, which the oligarchy prays it will never have to face, has already been faced by other oligarchies with discouraging results. Italian aristocrats and entrepreneurs, German Junkers and industrialists, Austrian business men and nobles have all bought peace and protection against the Beast of Bolshevism by subsidizing the militias of the Caesars. Something they have gotten from their bargain, but in each case they have found themselves enslaved in the end by those whom they rescued and put into power to save them. The Church of Rome, with all the wisdom of the centuries behind it, has faced the same problem and fallen into the same trap. To grant absolution and omnipotence to fascism as a means of salvation from communism is, by this showing, almost as dangerous as to surrender to communism forthwith. But from this too there is no escape once the bargain is struck. Those whose fears of proletarian radicalism and whose anxieties over property and privilege drive them to compromise with the brute power of the new barbarians are in the end undone—by their allies if not by their enemies.

Whether this is to be the fate of Tory Britain is a question mercifully unanswered. For the oligarchy there can be no abandonment of the road which it has taken. Its past has shaped its future in a mold beyond all changing. If Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton, so too was the ultimate fate of the Empire there decided. Those incapable of adaptation must either make old formulas work or perish. The oligarchy is incapable of changing its code, its creed or its way of life.

Half a century ago Ralph Waldo Emerson described its spirit with remarkable accuracy and insight:

> Truth in private life, untruth in public, marks these home-loving men. Their political conduct is not decided by general views, but by internal intrigues and personal and family interests. They cannot readily see beyond England. The history of Rome and Greece, when written by their scholars, degenerates into English party pamphlets. They cannot see beyond England, nor in England can they transcend the interests of the governing classes. "English principles" mean a primary regard to the interests of property. . . .
>
> The foreign policy of England, though ambitious and lavish of money, has not often been generous or just. It has a principal regard for the interest of trade, checked, however, by the aristocratic bias of the ambassador, which usually puts him in sympathy with the Continental Courts. It sanctioned the partition of Poland, it betrayed Genoa, Sicily, Parga, Greece, Turkey, Rome and Hungary. . . .
>
> Their mind is in a state of arrested development—a divine cripple like Vulcan, a blind *savant* like Huber and Sanderson. They do not occupy themselves on matters of general and lasting import, but on a corporeal civilization, on goods that perish in the using. . . . There is cramp limitation in their habit of thought, sleepy routine, and a tortoise's instinct to hold hard to the ground with his claws, lest he should be thrown on his back. There is a drag of inertia which resists reform in every shape.

FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN

This is the first of two articles on the Tory dialectic. —THE EDITORS

Automobiles of 1939

THE AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY is resorting to everything but mass prayers to head off another year like 1938. Nineteen thirty-seven was considered only a fair production year with somewhat over three and a third million cars sold. The year just ending saw car sales drop to half that number. Chevrolet's loss of 42 percent was less than the average. Ford lost 57 percent and dropped well behind Chevrolet in total sales. Plymouth took the average loss of 50 percent. The sales of Willys, which gave some promise of becoming America's leading low-priced car, dropped almost 68 percent. More failures in the automobile industry occurred in 1938 than in any year since 1933, according to Dun and Bradstreet reports.

To halt the catastrophic decline in car sales the automobile industry has been forced to reduce prices—although they are still higher than those of 1937—placate its dealers with more favorable contracts and make some changes in design in the interest of safety. The Pierce Arrow is no longer manufactured and the Terraplane line has been dropped by Hudson. But the debut of Ford's Mercury and the new Overland keep the total number of American lines the same.

Changes in front-end styling and improved vision are the two characteristics which most markedly distinguish 1939 cars from their predecessors. Cat-walk or fender-apron side grilles have been almost universally adopted. The decided increase in windshield and window area constitutes a real concession to the demand for cars which can be driven more safely. Among other changes worthy of mention are wider adoption of column-mounted shift levers; roomier bodies accompanied in many cases by the disappearance of the running board; and the more general use of rear coil springs, once unique to Buick. From the standpoint of economy, the appearance of an automatic overdrive which may be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cut out at the will of the driver is noteworthy. A number of manufacturers have simplified their standard or low-priced lines by dropping unessential equipment. More optional special equipment is therefore available at—of course—extra cost.

Although advertising and the salesmen still strive to center promotion around special features, actually the major structural differences which formerly characterized the "big three" groups—Ford, General Motors and Chrysler—have disappeared. Ford can no longer point to all-steel bodies nor Chevrolet to six-cylinder engines as distinguishing characteristics. Plymouth's hydraulic brakes haven't been worth stressing since Chevrolet adopted them several years ago, and now even Ford has abandoned the mechanical type.

So the battle for the 1939 market is on, with prices and dealer organization playing major roles. The buyer will be concerned with styles and prices and, it is to be hoped, transporation values. What will he find?

The similarity in front-end design is startling—catwalk cooling is used on almost all makes and there is a general tendency to lower and narrow the hood, all more or less following the Lincoln Zephyr motif. This change was undoubtedly made chiefly for style purposes. But it has the practical advantage of eliminating radiator grilles above the bumpers—a position where they have been especially vulnerable to damage. Following Ford's modification of Pierce Arrow design, Chrysler, Studebaker, Nash and Hudson have built headlamps into the front fender crowns.

Why such unanimity in styling? It's the industry's big secret—possibly it has something to do with convincing the public that cars are really new this year. More likely a shrinking market has made individual manufacturers wary of radical departures from what has been accepted. The public adopts major style changes with caution or not at all—as Chrysler learned to his sorrow with the Airflow model. The new policy seems to be "when we change, we change together."

Better vision at last for most, but not all, cars. It is obtained through the use of larger windshields and windows and of smaller corner posts. And appearance as well has thereby been improved. Increased visibility is especially marked in the General Motors automobiles in the higher price range. Plymouth is an example of a make which is little, if any, changed in this respect. The trend toward better vision is the first concrete evidence that automobile manufacturers have decided that something must be done about safety. They will show even greater evidence of their concern when automobile power is reduced to a figure more nearly compatible with the amount which can be used with safety under ordinary driving conditions.

Gearshift control levers mounted on the steering column, first introduced by Pierce Arrow in 1905, have been widely adopted or offered as optional equipment. Ford, Graham, Hupmobile, Nash and Overland are the major exceptions. This shift to so-called "remote control" removes the wobble-stick from the floor. A word of caution to those veteran drivers who are conditioned to wobble-sticks—changing one's gear-shifting reflexes may not be the simple thing the salesman would have you believe. Chevrolet offers as optional equipment a vacuum-actuated shifting mechanism. It operates on the same principle as the vacuum boosters for brakes: a definite proportion of the total effort required for shifting is supplied by a vacuum cylinder.

One of the most significant developments this year is the introduction of the Warner gear overdrive. This mechanism has two distinct advantages not offered in previous overdrives: its cutting-in speed, which is between twenty-five and thirty miles per hour, is much lower; and the driver can cut out the overdrive at any time by fully depressing the accelerator pedal. With the overdrive going into operation at speeds around twenty-five miles per hour, its economy advantages can be realized even in relatively congested urban traffic. If for any reason the driver needs the full power for acceleration, he can return to regular gear at will. The Warner gear is offered as either standard or optional equipment on the Studebaker, Chrysler, De Soto, Nash, Graham, Hupmobile and Packard.

Two lines of Chevrolets are again offered this year, the Master 85 and the Master De Luxe. The Master 85 sells for $689 at the factory, $41 less than last year and $20 under the Ford 85. In the Master De Luxe line a new independent suspension of the open-coil-wishbone link-type supersedes the Dubonnet type used since 1934. This and the optional vacuum-power gear shift mentioned previously are about the only claims to distinction Chevrolet offers this year. Minor changes in details have been made throughout; the "speedline" has been removed, the instrument panel redesigned.

Among the cars made by Chrysler, Plymouth and Dodge have adopted the independent front-wheel suspension, long used on the De Soto and Chrysler. The 1939 Plymouth Roadking is priced at $726, only $4 lower than last year and $17 above the Ford 85. The wheelbase on all thirteen body types has been increased by two inches. This change and the new vertical radiator grille have added ten inches to the length of the hood—not contributing to Plymouth's highly touted safety features. The windshield is now the center-bar V-type.

A new feature on all Chrysler-made cars is the "safety-signal" speedometer. A light on the indicator needle changes from green to amber at thirty miles per hour, remains amber up to fifty miles per hour and then changes to red above that speed. Continued emphasis is placed on "inside safety," even to making windshield-wiper buttons of soft rubber and providing for recessed pushbuttons for the radio.

Engine horsepowers have been stepped up in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Chrysler Royal Six and Imperial and the Warner gear overdrive is available, at extra cost, for both these lines. Just announced as standard equipment on the Custom Imperial is the hydraulic clutch, called "fluid drive." This new clutch operates on the hydraulic-turbine principle—the conventional clutch disks are replaced by two sets of turbine blades with oil used as the power-transmitting medium. A car so equipped can be stopped in high without killing the engine and started in high without bucking.

Ford adopts hydraulic brakes! One almost awaits the announcement that the CIO has been invited to organize the workers. But there they are—hydraulic brakes on all Fords, the new Mercury and the Lincoln Zephyr. Only the Lincoln among Ford's cars retains mechanical brakes, a "link of steel from foot to wheel."

Of the two Ford lines, the V-8 and the De Luxe V-8, the latter bears a strong family resemblance in styling to the Lincoln Zephyr and the new Mercury. The V-8 can be had with either the eighty-five or sixty horsepower engine, the De Luxe with the eighty-five only. One noteworthy change has been made in the Ford engines—narrower piston rings are used in an attempt to decrease their notoriously high oil consumption. And to Ford must go credit for the lead taken last year and continued in 1939 in providing better vision by the use of larger windows and lower and narrower hoods. The new Mercury, with which Ford filled in the price gap between the De Luxe V-8 and Lincoln Zephyr, is similar to the Zephyr in body size and is powered with a ninety-five-horsepower V-8 engine.

With the exception of the Bantam, the Willys still bears the distinction of being America's lowest priced automobile. Willys-Overland's new car, the Overland, has a four-cylinder engine of the same size as that of the Willys. Main differences between it and the Willys are in front-end styling and its greater horsepower. The extra power is obtained by stepping up the compression ratio and speed, made possible by the use of the new aluminum-alloy tin-plated pistons. The factory delivered price is $601, $41 higher than the Willys and $68 less than the Ford 60.

Pontiac offers the De Luxe Eight, the De Luxe Six and the new Quality Six. The Quality Six is a new smaller car at a new low price for Pontiac by some $50. The bodies of the De Luxe models are two inches lower and may be had with or without running boards. Better and more uniform riding qualities are claimed for the new "variable-rate" springs which have helper springs that come into action as the load is increased. All models are now equipped with hypoid gears, alligator hoods and "remote-control" gear shift. Engines remain practically the same. Pontiac De Luxe 6 now sells for $922, higher by $6 than last year.

The Buick, one of General Motors' most popular higher priced cars, is characterized this year by new body styling—smooth, sleek fairing of hood and fenders, replacement of the former center grille by fender-apron side grilles and greatly improved vision. "Stream Boards," narrow strips set off with stainless-steel moldings, are offered on some models in place of the regular running boards. "Sunshine" sliding tops, long available in European cars, and particularly desirable for those who want maximum enjoyment of sun, air and scenery, are offered as optional equipment for the Buick and also three other General Motors cars—Oldsmobile, LaSalle and Cadillac.

All models of the Buick are powered as formerly with the valve-in-head engines, only minor changes in certain parts, including the fuel pump and carburetor, having been made. On the 40 and 60 models, advantage has been taken of the rear-coil-spring construction by terminating the frame at the coil springs. The rear body structure has been straightened to carry the luggage compartment, and mountings are provided for the rear bumpers. Buick claims that this construction, that is, terminating the frame at the coil springs, will lessen the severity of rear-end crashes and likelihood of injury to passengers—a specious argument if there is anything to the contentions of manufacturers that in head-on collisions protection is provided by the heavy engine and frame out in front.

The column-mounted shift lever and automatic clutch are standard on all Hudson models this year. The Selective Automatic Shift (formerly the Electric Hand) may be had with all models save the 112. A new feature is the Auto-Poise steering control—a torsional stabilizer linked to the steering knuckles. Its action is similar to a front-wheel caster: that is, it helps to straighten out the car after turning corners and will, so it is claimed, reduce driving effort in cross winds and on rough roads.

A Hudson feature being used as basis for a lot of hullaballoo is the Airfoam cushion. "Airfoam," buyers are told, "is the pure milk of the rubber tree. . . . Air is beaten into it until it turns to foam." Eventually are produced "seats that 'breathe' as your body moves," that fit the contours of the buttocks as no upholstered spring cushion ever can. "Try an Airfoam ride"—and you will never again be satisfied to sit at home.

Nash continues to place great emphasis on its "conditioned-air" heater, newly dubbed the "Weather-Eye," but differing in no fundamental respect from last year's heater. The heater now has automatic temperature control so that any degree of heat from "spring coolness to shirtsleeve warmth" may be had. Winter air only will be "conditioned" as special wing-type windows are now installed in front doors for summer ventilation. But it is as true this year as in 1938 that heated fresh air is not conditioned air. The horsepower of the Nash LaFayette has been raised; the ratings of the engines in the Ambassador Six and Eight remain the same.

Packard's design is in keeping with its tradition—outward changes are so slight as hardly to distinguish the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

new cars from the old, a practice to be heartily commended unless changes in styling are related to transportation needs and safety. A new Super-Eight series is offered to fill in the price gap between the Eight (formerly 120) and the Twelve.

How nearly do the 1939 cars conform to the needs and preferences of American drivers? Far from closely if a study made by Facts, Inc., and reported in Automotive Industries can be taken as a criterion. This study, announced as one of the first comprehensive surveys of consumers' ideas of present-day cars, was based on interviews with 542 automobile owners living in all parts of the country. To quote the report: "The sorest point with the automobile consumer today is lack of economy in gasoline consumption. Next to that, in order named, come visibility and durability."

The survey revealed that the low-priced car owner would like to get 21.7 miles per gallon but actually gets about 16.4. The medium and high-priced car owner wants 20.5 miles per gallon and gets only 14.2. The 1939 cars will offer little or nothing in improved mileage. True, weight has been reduced and carburetors improved in some cases, but these changes which should work for more economical operation are frequently offset by increased horsepower. In most cases engine design has not been changed significantly, therefore mileages which obtained for last year's cars will apply quite closely to 1939 models.

About the only comparative mileage data on American cars made public are those from the Gilmore-Yosemite Economy Run, sponsored by the Gilmore Oil Company and supervised by the American Automobile Association. Taking the results of last year's run and reducing the average miles per gallon by 20 percent to approximate actual driving conditions (the Gilmore run is made at fairly constant, comparatively low speed with cars in better-than-average condition) we get the following approximate mileages for a number of cars:

Willys	24
Ford 60	23
Studebaker 6	19.5
Nash 6	18.9
Lincoln Zephyr 12	18.8
Nash LaFayette 6	17.8
Chevrolet 6	17.6
Pontiac 6	17.4
Plymouth 6	17
Dodge 6	16.9
De Soto 6	16.6
Packard 6	16.2
Nash 8	15.8
Oldsmobile 6	15.4
Packard 8	13

Data from other sources show that even these mileages will not be attained if the engine is badly out of tune or the car constantly driven at high speeds.

At what average speed do car owners drive and what maximum speed is considered adequate? In answer to these questions the Facts, Inc., study disclosed that city drivers average 26.3 miles per hour while the average for country drivers is 46. The average maximum speed desired by all of those questioned was 64.8. The average top speed of the 1937 and 1938 cars was 87.5 miles per hour—35 percent faster than car owners wanted to go.

Visibility, second major sore point, according to the study, has been improved in this year's cars, but that does not alter the fact that much can, and should, still be done by reducing the width of roof supports and by shortening and lowering the hood.

The question of car life has been hotly debated for years—owners demanding more durable cars with the industry emphasizing that cars last much longer than formerly; the industry pointing out that cars are driven much harder than they used to be, with consumers insisting that on present-day roads modern automobiles are not subjected to the strains imposed upon their predecessors. It is true that the mileage on a car which has finally reached the junk pile is considerably higher than it used to be. But the depression years, which forced owners to drive their old cars long after they were giving satisfactory service, may partially account for this fact.

Be that as it may, there is no excuse for the poor workmanship and use of cheap and defective parts frequently encountered on late model cars: rusted lamp trims and cowls, cracked rubber mountings, defective chromium plate, fuel pumps and carburetors which have failed all too quickly, poorly fitted doors, bumpers that do not protect the car. The lack of standardization of bumper heights is the cause of endless exasperation as the result of locking bumper horns with the car in front or in back.

Consumer votes on the "best-looking" car as revealed by the Facts, Inc., survey were interesting if inconsistent. The Packard received more than twice as many votes as any other make. The next four cars in order of preference were the Nash Ambassador, Buick, Graham, Lincoln Zephyr. Chevrolet was ninth choice, Plymouth sixteenth. Ford and Willys trailed among those liked least of all. The results of this study show a curious mixture in preferences for conservative and advanced styling. But one thing that does stand out is that car buyers show no particular enthusiasm for the "looks" of the most widely sold popular-priced cars. There is ample evidence that owners are more critical of their cars than manufacturers will admit, that they are definitely dissatisfied with operating costs, durability and safety. To what extent consideration of such factors affects car sales no one knows with any certainty, but prospective purchasers may be certain that the 1939 cars offer no great improvements in these respects.

DEWEY H. PALMER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Watch France!

THE TWO RECENT TESTS OF STRENGTH in the struggle between the anti-democratic and democratic forces in France have not been conclusive. The government, from a formal point of view, won in both cases: the general strike failed to achieve its main purpose, and Parliament approved the Reynaud decree laws. But the strike was suppressed only by an exceptional display of military strength and misleading propaganda; and the parliamentary majority obtained by Daladier is so slim that his situation seems more precarious than ever. For that reason it is still impossible to formulate definite prophecies about France's immediate future, especially as nowadays the internal developments in any European country depend so much on the international situation. But it is possible to see the plans pursued by the French reactionary parties.

These plans involve a triple purpose: (1) The destruction of the CGT (Confédération Générale du Travail); (2) the prohibition of the Communist Party; and (3) the suppression of parliamentary control. The entire press of the Right, including the anti-Munich group led by Kerillis, urges the realization of this program. Kerillis merely insists that the work has to be done without the assistance of Hitler.

The government offensive against the labor unions is already well under way. Following the general strike of November 30, a great number of workers, probably more than a million, have been locked out. They are rehired individually, and Communist and union militants are systematically eliminated. In official speeches and broadcasts, Daladier and other members of his Cabinet constantly reiterate the theme of conciliation and appeasement; "loyal" collaboration of the workers in the task of national recovery, they insist, is absolutely indispensable. But the policy pursued in government-controlled industries and utilities is exactly the same as that of the private big manufacturers; and as a matter of fact the latter have taken their cue from the former. Thus, in the nationalized aviation plants and arsenals, the "purge" of militants is being ruthlessly carried out, without much regard for the ensuing disorganization of production. Moreover, the CGT is torn by internal discord. Strikers and non-strikers, workers and white-collar employees dispute with one another. In several unions there had been a majority against the strike; some union officials and a part of the membership have already tendered their resignations. Group rivalries within the unions are sharpening. Many members feel that by announcing the strike five days in advance and thus allowing Daladier time to prepare, the CGT leadership has definitely proved its incapacity.

The second point of the Rightist program is more difficult to carry out. Daladier has no serious backing in the country. He has no storm troops, no original ideas, no real popularity within his own party. He can remain at the head of the government only by strictly observing the rules of parliamentary politics. Even the army has no confidence in him. For all these reasons it would be dangerous for him to compromise his only source of strength, Parliament. He knows that the Right supports him only to be able to absorb him, and he realizes the need of a counterbalance at the Left. His Jacobin ideas are not contradictory to his plans of destroying the labor unions in order to maintain the rights of the centralized state; they are contradictory to the suppression of a political party. The prohibition of the Communist Party would immediately turn against him a large part of his present following.

On the other hand, the Rightists want immediate concessions for their support of Daladier. One of their most important demands is the introduction of a new type of ballot which would be very favorable for them under the present circumstances: proportional representation, not on a national scale, but based on a separate list for each electoral district. This would eliminate the possibility of a combined Left vote on the second ballot. The Right will not agree to adjourn Parliament and grant Daladier another period of rule by decree unless they obtain this new method of "representation." For then they would be sure to get rid of Daladier later, and to snatch political power from the present holders of it, the Radical Socialist Party.

Paris

HENRI LEFEBVRE

Offering for the Time Capsule

On those who burn parliaments, and books, and treaties

Know there was a moment came and went,
When what some said and what the others said,
When both were found to be incompetent
And we dared hope that there might rise instead

A gentler doctrine, lacking the haste of these,
That would, in meeting matters of the State,
Have made us see things as the gardener sees—
This doctrine came—but frailly, and too late.

Arose the Teutons yapping with belief
That made their minds the replica of fists
And gave heroic, ominous relief
After the scorn of France's theorists.

It was their best they drew on for their worst—
It was the nation's greatness that did fall—
They were by mental benefits accursed,
And in their madness, metaphysical.

Know that the time when jungle strife was through
And there was bounty here for everyone,
Know that precisely then the contest grew
And what the books had done was now undone.

Know that we caught the fleeting glimpse of peace—
Know that we saw the mildly glowing light
Of ways that could have given us release—
And then we sank into a dreary night.

KENNETH BURKE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shoot the Works

Enough Is Enough

MOST OF THE SINS against a free press in America have consisted of a slanting of news in the direction desired by the editor. When such instances can be found, nobody can logically defend them. But it seems to me that a new affliction has come upon democratic journalism. In many cases papers are presenting generous space and headlines to persons who do not deserve them by any canon of what constitutes news. Naturally I am not going to put myself in the position of saying that I deplore fair play or that the answer to the regimented press of the aggressor nations should be a controlled popular-front press in the democracies. But I object to the growing practice of leaning over backwards lest your adversary may cry "foul" or "I was robbed."

This factor has come up sharply in the case of Father Coughlin. The issue of both radio and newspaper censorship has been raised. Coughlin himself is certain to play these issues for all he is worth. But even under this threat I do not think a newspaper should make the abject surrender of giving him all the space his little heart desires at times when he is obviously propounding statements of fact which are of doubtful authenticity. The right of free opinion should not confer upon an individual the privilege of having his remarks printed if he insists on going around saying, "This is Thursday," upon a bright and sunny Monday morning.

I have in mind the broadcast by Father Coughlin which led to the rupture of relations between him and WMCA. This was a speech in which the kindly cleric of Royal Oak stated that the Bolshevik revolution in Russia was led almost wholly by Jews and financed entirely by American Jewish bankers. You may remember, if you read the extended account in The New York Times, that Father Coughlin cited as authorities for his statements "reports of the United States Secret Service" which were in the possession of a distinguished Irish prelate and material contained in confidential British diplomatic papers.

It seemed at first blush a tall story. There was a day when any efficient managing editor would have said, "This all sounds pretty cockeyed to me and I am not going to print a line until I can get some sort of confirmation or denial." That is still a good rule to be followed in the case of statements which appear on the surface to be outlandish. I am aware of the fact that certain men loom so large in the news that even their errors are properly a matter of record. Yet there should be no considerable lapse of time between the printing of a questionable fact and its denial on the part of the person capable of speaking with authority. The race between the truth and misstatements is quite similar to the famous match of the tortoise against the hare. The truth is mighty and will prevail but often it gets away badly from the barrier and makes a sorry showing in the back stretch. Apparently thousands of persons are still unaware that the picture set up by his eminence of Royal Oak has been punctured full of holes. Today we find certain groups passing resolutions in support of Coughlin and insisting that he has been made the victim of a corrupt and cruel censorship.

I admit that one man's truth may be another's fallacious propaganda. In matters of opinion it may well be impossible to draw the line between the false and true. Even in factual reports a situation may be so muddled that it is not just to say whether or not one side or the other is right. But I insist that in matters where there can be no argument about the fact the right of free press or free radio should not give any individual, whether mighty or humble, the privilege of reiterating incorrect information. Father Coughlin has said that the United States Secret Service has documents proving that the Russian revolution was financed by American Jewish bankers. Responsible heads of the Secret Service deny this. Kerensky and Trotsky, who are certainly not in agreement on anything else, assert that Father Coughlin has been wholly misled. It is of course his right to bring new evidence to light, if he can find it, in order to make his statement good. But as the case stands, from a journalistic point of view, the weight of testimony is against him. In such circumstances it would seem that Father Coughlin owed the public an apology and that the press and radio owe him nothing.

Much the same procedure went on in the reports of hearings before the Dies Committee. Some of the witnesses did submit documents, but on many occasions individuals appeared before the investigators, were duly sworn, and then proceeded to pull opinions out of a hat and hand them over as undoubted facts. Congressional committees traditionally do not impose the same strict rules which prevail in a court of law. Admittedly they are semi-judicial bodies and it is not unreasonable that hearsay and mere suspicion should be allowed to creep into the record. But the newspapers should clearly differentiate between that which is charged and that which seems to be proved. In many cases unsubstantiated testimony has been played up in headlines which have given the effect of facts nailed down beyond question. And often the accused person has been able to get no more than some tiny shirttail of denial in opposition to the flaming headline.

I have no doubt that the intent of The New York Daily News was wholly honorable in reprinting the Silver Shirt list of men with Jewish names who occupy positions large or small in the government service. Indeed an editorial in that paper stated that it was an honor roll rather than a bill of indictment. Something can be said for that point of view, but I'm afraid that Pelley, the Silver Shirt leader, will be pleased rather than otherwise to find his list publicized in a paper of huge circulation. He now gets to the attention of persons who would never be reached by the house organ of the Silver Shirts. And certain essential facts may be overlooked in any such survey. For instance, if the list shows that many leaders and organizers in the garment industry are Jewish, it ought to be pointed out that so are most of the employees. Mr. Pelley did not dwell on this fact. He also listed several individuals who by chance are not Jewish.

Every man should have his day in court. Each person who has anything to say of news interest ought to find his place in the news columns whether his cause is good, bad or indifferent. But I am wholly against any practice of bending over backwards and giving a disproportionate amount of space to demagogues on the theory that anything less will give them the chance to scream that they are being censored. They are going to holler in any case. And I think the journalistic rule should be, "Let 'em holler."

HEYWOOD BROUN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Fink Farmers

ONE OF THE EARLIEST ISSUES to come before the Senate next month will be the continuation of the La Follette Civil Liberties Committee. The committee's funds are almost exhausted, and, unless a further appropriation can be obtained, its activities must end some time in January. To liberal and labor groups here, this would be a disaster of the first order, and an attempt is now being made to recruit enough senatorial votes to prevent it.

The Senate's decision will probably turn on whether or not its members favor an X-ray look at the Associated Farmers, allegedly fascist West Coast group that viciously attacked the New Deal at the last election. For many weeks the La Follette Committee staff has been studying the Associated Farmers and its sources of funds. But unless a new appropriation is authorized, no hearings can be held.

Persons familiar with West Coast politics say that the need for an inquiry into the affairs of the Associated Farmers is very great. The anti-labor legislation they sponsored in the recent election, although defeated in California and Washington, was carried in Oregon. In consequence, Oregon has become a guinea-pig state for experimentation in breaking labor unions by legislative decree. Already Oregon employers have been enabled to smash a number of small strikes. What New Dealers would like to have the La Follette Committee find out is the nature of the relationship between the Associated Farmers and the National Manufacturers' Association. It is true that at its annual meeting in New York, the "don't-rock-the-boat" faction of the NAM prevailed. But if the Oregon legislation goes unchallenged by organized labor and the New Deal, how long will it be before the NAM is advocating similar laws?

There is another reason why an investigation of the Associated Farmers by the La Follette Committee is urgently necessary. It is needed to offset the headline-lassoing exploits of Mr. Dies. The simple truth is that the New Dealers are in the deepest sort of funk about Mr. Dies. The recent Gallup poll, purporting to show a large majority of voters in favor of Mr. Dies's activities, has shaken the New Dealers' nerve. It is helplessly assumed that he will obtain the $200,000 he is asking and will continue his free comic-strip feature as long as the newspapers will print it.

By an odd coincidence, it happens that Mr. Dies and the Associated Farmers have the same favorite horror story—the supposed delay of Secretary Perkins in prosecuting the deportation case against Mr. Harry Bridges. If Mr. Dies obtains new funds, he means to comb the country for anti-Bridges witnesses. This is precisely the gift the Associated Farmers hope that Santa Claus will leave in their stocking. New Dealers think that there is an opportunity here for the La Follette Committee to render a great public service.

By the recent remarks of Secretary Morgenthau and other high administration officials, the Export-Import bank has been made to seem a mighty instrument for keeping Fascist trade and political influence out of Latin America. It is certain that German and Italian exports to South America are heavily subsidized. By an official decree, German firms in the export industries must pay over certain sums to Herr Göring to enable German goods to be sold abroad below cost. Many New Dealers, accordingly, argue that the least the administration should do is to see that our business men with Latin American orders receive intermediate and long-term banking accommodation.

There is a second group of administration officials, however, who stoutly oppose such a program, and advance powerful arguments to uphold their position. In brief, they point out that there are two great reasons why credits for the Latin American trade cannot be obtained through normal banking channels. The first is that many Latin American countries have defaulted on their bonds. It is true that we are largely to blame. In the 1920's, American business men, with the enthusiastic support of the Hoover and Coolidge regimes, forced large amounts of money on Latin American republics for armaments and governmental palaces that they could not afford. Nevertheless, the harm that was done then has not, in the case of many countries, been repaired.

The second obstacle to new credits is the currency restrictions that most Latin American countries now maintain. These restrictions are the result partly of too-great external debt, partly of existing low prices for the raw materials that these countries sell abroad. They are not Latin America's fault, but they exist. Moreover, Latin America knows that under the usual rules defaulted bonds and currency restrictions would be an effective bar against fresh credits.

Accordingly, Washington officials who are opposing an extension of the Export-Import bank's activities argue that Latin Americans are bound to consider any new loans as political. If this country wished primarily to increase its trade with Latin America, the New York bankers would be prodded into scaling down existing Latin American bond issues and adjusting interest payments. Even more necessary, we would cut our tariffs on agricultural products and metals far below anything that Mr. Hull's reciprocity program has so far contemplated, so that Latin Americans could obtain better prices for their exports. As long as we decline to undertake the measures that a capitalist economy requires, Latin Americans are likely to conclude that we aren't chiefly interested in trade, but simply want to keep Germany and Italy out of the hemisphere. Under such circumstances our credits to Latin American countries would fall to the same level as those given by France to Poland and Rumania in the dear, forgotten days of Poincaré, or those that all the great European countries are now trying to force on nationalist Turkey.

The opposition New Deal group argues that as soon as the word is spread about that an industrial corporation wishing to dump its surplus in Latin America can obtain what amounts to free money from the administration, we shall rapidly see the rise of the same mingled government and business racketeering that obtains in Germany and Italy. They say that it inevitably means high-pressure business lobbying, graft and scandal. In the last few days, this group has made an increasing number of converts. It now seems likely that, while the Export-Import bank's charter will be renewed in the coming session of Congress, its loans will be strictly confined to special emergencies.

Washington T. R. B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Other People's Money

Primer on Money

A READER ASKS A QUESTION. The question has been asked by other readers but not so intelligently. And it has been asked me a hundred times since the depression started. Here is the question as framed by Miss Margaret A. Gaffney of Whitman, Massachusetts:

> At the beginning of the year the money in the country amounts to M. The wealth of the country amounts to W. During the year much wealth is produced. At the end of the year does the amount of wealth in the country equal W + P (P meaning production)? Is the amount of money at the end of the year, supposing none has left the country, M + I (I meaning interest)? Or has the money merely been redistributed so that the total amount is still M? I mean paper bills and coins, not credit or checks. In other words, where does interest come from or how does the volume of money contract or expand?

First of all, it is not possible to limit the meaning of money to paper bills and coins. These are only a part of the money which the country uses. The country uses currency (paper and coin) and bank credit. Here is how both of these kinds of money are created or extinguished.

The volume of paper money and coin has nothing whatever to do with interest. This kind of money is issued by the government and called in by the government in obedience to entirely different reasons. It is constantly changing its volume. It changes from month to month and often from week to week. A mine produces gold and takes it to the Treasury and gets paper money in return for it. A bank imports gold, sends it to the Treasury and gets a Treasury certificate for it. At different times during the year merchants and business men need large supplies of paper and coin money because of the volume and velocity of cash purchases.

Such a time is Christmas. Beginning about November 1, merchants find retail sales rising. This rise reaches its peak at Christmas. They need immense sums of small coins and dollar bills for change. Banks need immense amounts of crisp new bills for depositors who want them for Christmas presents. The merchants ask for more coin and bills at their banks. The supply is pressed. The banks ask the government for more coins, usually the Reserve Board for more bills. They buy the coins just as they do anything else. For the Reserve notes—paper currency—they either make checks against their Federal Reserve balances or they deposit government bonds in the Federal Reserve Banks in exchange for paper currency. Later when they do not need so much currency they redeposit it in the Reserve Banks and redeem their bonds. For various reasons which we need not enumerate, the business community or the government wishes to expand the amount of currency in circulation. And this can be done, within limits, *ad libitum*.

Currency is used merely as a convenience. Only a moderate part of the nation's business is done with it. And these expansions and limitations of the volume are wholly unconnected with profits, interest, losses. The government controls this volume purely to suit the needs and conveniences of business. So, as to one part of the question, the amount of money (M) in the country at the end of the year will in no wise depend on business done or interest paid.

But to set straight the business of interest and the contraction and expansion of the real-money supplies of the country, we have to look at the very thing excluded by the question—that is, bank money. The great expansion and contraction of money supplies takes place in the creation and extinguishment of bank money.

For instance, in 1929 the government money (coins and currency) amounted in volume to $4,746,000,000. Demand deposits in the banks amounted to $24,350,000,000. By 1933, when interest and profits and business were so much smaller, government money amounted to $5,720,000,000, or $1,000,000,000 more. But demand deposits, or bank money, amounted to only $15,000,000,000, or $9,350,000,000 less.

Now why did demand deposits shrink? First, how are they created? The base, of course, is government money or cash. To simplify the operation (and this is the kernel of the whole thing) imagine a company starting a new bank with $100,000 capital, the whole amount in paper and coins. The very first day many persons deposit another $100,000 in paper and coins. The bank now has $200,000 in deposits—all cash. Then a depositor makes a loan of $1,000. The banker does not give him cash. Instead he writes in the depositor's book "Deposit—$1,000." The depositor-borrower leaves the bank knowing he has $1,000 deposited there. Now at the same time the banker writes in his own books a record of a $1,000 deposit. Remember, the bank has received no additional money. When the depositor walked in, the bank had $200,000 in deposits. When he walked out, the bank had $201,000 in deposits. But it had received no additional coin or paper or money of any kind. All it got was the borrower's note for $1,000.

Of course the borrower will write a check the next day to someone in payment of the house he wanted to buy. The bank will promptly lose that deposit, since the withdrawal check will wipe it out. But the $1,000 will go into the bank of the person to whom the check is given. It will merely be transferred to another bank. The operation of borrowing that $1,000 will increase the deposits of the whole banking system by $1,000. This $1,000 will be wiped out when the process is reversed and the loan is paid.

It is chiefly in this way that bank money is expanded and contracted. And here again this has nothing to do with the payment of interest or profits. Of course bank deposits may be and are enlarged and reduced by the flow of government money in business.

Now given a certain volume of wealth in the country at the beginning of the year and a certain amount of production at the end of the year and a certain amount of consumption (or destruction) of wealth during the year, at the end of the year the wealth would be expressed as W + P — C (C being consumption).

The amount of money in the country would be increased by the increase of commercial bank credit plus the increase in foreign deposits plus the increase in the volume of government money (or minus any one of these quantities).

As for interest, profits, wages, etc., these would merely represent constant redistributions of this volume of money.

There's a little more to it than this. But this is the general outline of the process.

JOHN T. FLYNN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ars Longa

Here Come the Clowns, by Philip Barry. Booth Theatre, December 7, 1938.
American Landscape, by Elmer Rice. Cort Theatre, December 5, 1938.

NOW AND AGAIN, in the course of the theatrical season, one way or another, appear things to illustrate the biological aspect of art. One way or another it all comes back to something almost wholly biological: either the work of art, like a human body, like living tissue, like a vegetable —a carrot or beet—is alive or it is not; and nothing can be done that would counterbalance that fact. Whatever we feel about some matter, whatever passionate emphasis we bring to the statement of it, whatever display of actual situation or private violence there may be, whatever hunger after luminous images, whatever ransacking of history, whatever impact of prejudice or force of righteous cause, a cold fact remains. Either matters come alive in theatre terms or, so far as the theatre goes, they do not exist at all. It is through a fact like this that the immediacy of the theatre art appears.

This immediacy of appeal is both a limitation and an asset. No other art so readily as that of the theatre invites the phrase *the quick and the dead.* Both these new plays, Mr. Barry's and Mr. Rice's, though in different ways, illustrate the point.

"Here Come the Clowns"—in a setting by Mr. John Koenig that is fussy but curiously right dramatically to the needs of this play—happens, save for a kind of prologue moment before the curtain, in the back room of Ma Speedy's Café des Artistes, following on eleven o'clock at night, that is to say, when all performances are over. A considerable number of people come on the scene before the last moment of the story and its settlements evolve; the gist is that Dan Clancy, fresh from the penitentiary, is looking up his wife and, as we gradually learn, looking for God. There is a skeptic and there is the Professor of Illusion. There are wives and women; there are divers performers from the show, one of them a dwarf (not a midget). And then, rather suddenly, at the very end of the play, certain lofty thoughts are introduced, less pressing than what may have happened but less prepared for than what may now be desired. People in the audience who up to this point have been intermittently delighted and bored are now merely mystified.

There has been for a long time a tendency to complain of the daily newspaper reviews of the theatre, and with regard to this Barry play I heard, as I expected to hear, it said that you could not tell from the reviews whether the damned critics liked the play or not.

With this in mind I carefully reread what Mr. John Anderson, Mr. John Mason Brown and Mr. Brooks Atkinson had in their various columns seen fit to record. On the whole, I think, they did very well indeed. Reading their lines I was compelled to admire the diffused and sociable precision with which they expressed their respect for the playwright's intentions, past achievements, forward-looking subject matter and approach, and the equally exact conveyance of the tedium they felt at his present effort. Each of these reviews of theirs conveyed also the sense we get of fine intervals as such, of genuine and thrilling invention now and then in moments such as that when the dwarf stands beneath the very elbow of the Professor of Illusion, in the midst of all those other broken and distorted lives. That the critics wished the author well was clear, and wished his play well, and clearly too they could not find their way in it. Which, without the freshness and the lively justness that those articles displayed, is pretty much the way I feel about it.

We should stay, however, to say that Mr. Chalzel as the evil Illusionist played much too slowly; there was something wrong to exasperation in the fact that we mere ordinary mortals, supposed to see so little, were constantly seeing ahead of this all-seeing and seemingly endless pauser. Mr. Eddie Dowling, in the part of the returned husband, searching the byways of life for his own dream, played with great tenderness and feeling, and never failed to preserve, when there was occasion for it, the full beauty of Mr. Barry's writing. His role was completely balanced by Mr. Russell Collins' skeptic. Of all our actors on Broadway he is one of the most thoroughly technical in a fine sense, and one of those whose work has the easiest range, variety and richness in values.

We have been hearing for some time that memory *per se* is educationally, as it were, not so highly considered as it once was; thought, thinking, thought processes, these are said to be the great desideratum. Whatever we may believe about that, we might find it suggestive when we come to acting to think of mimicry as a parallel to memory. And whatever we may think of that in turn, it seems to me certain that the performance of "Here Come the Clowns" would gain a great deal by taking each of these many characters in hand and trying to develop it as one of the real cases, colors, lightings, pressures and ructions out of our visible human life. In sum, except for the most tragic or the most stylized theatre, a certain degree of characterization, impersonation really, could never do anybody any harm; what's good enough for life ought, with its restatement by an artist, of course, be good enough for the theatre. One of the disadvantages our present stage enjoys is that most of our players possess neither the reference and earthiness of mimicry on the one hand, nor on the other the security and grace of style.

Mr. Elmer Rice's play is even more an illustration of the hard facts of life in a work of art. "American Landscape" celebrates a further progress for the Playwrights' Company, marked already by Mr. Maxwell Anderson's play about early New York and Mr. Sherwood's Lincoln, and still expectant of issue by Mr. Sidney Howard and by Mr. S. N. Behrman.

In an earlier play of Mr. Rice's like "Street Scene," his gifts for casting and directing carried the play a long way forward, as far in fact, or as near, as the Pulitzer Prize, et cetera. There was also "The Adding Machine," the nature of the dramatic method imitated—the expressionistic —bearing down hard upon it and keeping it rather better than its general public saw. In those days we thought of Mr. Rice as championing popular, even pink, causes. "American Landscape," as it brings him back to Broadway, which he once renounced, brings us his championship of people with property or, even worse, with tradition, in the midst of our changing world of unions, middlemen and so on. In this case death helps Mr. Rice with his dénouement and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the end of a tedious play, almost never created and nearly always banal and overexplicit, not to speak of its being directed and acted with a stoical and cosmic flatness. The last pages of Mr. Barry's play and all of Mr. Rice's could profit by a strict study of Chekhov.

Miss Aline Bernstein's room for an old Connecticut house is admirable. STARK YOUNG

The Good with the Bad

MOVIES are such common and lowly stuff that in intellectual circles we often find ourselves leaping, like trout for flies, after something in a new offering that promises to set it off from the average run, something of special interest or fame, in short any branch of art certified to have nothing to do with that of making pictures. If Jean Cocteau (ah fame!) should make a little job that ran backwards, all in black and no hands or cameras (ah soul!), you give me a good publicity department and I'll give you a good press for it, and a certain discerning audience.

This leads up to the new movie made from a Shaw play, with the permission and active connivance of old twinkle-eye himself: "Pygmalion." The film is going down very handsomely with many more types than would find interest in a Shaw play, which is suggestion enough that they managed to make an interesting movie out of it: in addition to a fresh idea it has humor, gadgets, romance and edges of comment. A brilliant phonetician takes over the job of passing off a flower girl as the best English blood, and makes her so lovely and so involves his heart in the process that the joke is off and he can't live without her. Many of the lines are good and the dustman part is both full and sly. But extending all through the length of a feature picture is just what it takes to give it away: in the end their main problem neither had much to do with phonetics nor was solved: the natural ease and grace on which success mostly depended can never be taught and rarely aped and at any rate wasn't expressed here. If we are going to bring high intellect to the benighted movies, what I say is let's have an intellect that won't go around taking absurd pratfalls on its own back stairs.

"Pygmalion" has none of that sense of spring you get when comedy seems to leave the humdrum of its manufacture naturally and with its own crazy grace. Here it is always somehow calculated and self-conscious—not only in the general sweep but in each detail, as when an effect has to be registered and the camera goes smack to a close-up of SURPRISE, RAISED-EYEBROWS and all the rest, or to a posed group of hopeful extras; as when an interlude of symbolic shots follows too fast from too many trick angles; as when a scene is held beyond its measure or a small device repeated like a headache. And there has been no balder makeshift in modern theatricals than the introduction of Major Whosis as confidant and commentator.

This is all tied up in my mind with Leslie Howard as the star and co-director. A sensitive actor on his own plane, he tackles comedy with a serious vim that would be impossible to describe if Stark Young hadn't described it already, saying of Howard's carriage in a similar part that he went at it like an undertaker with a sense of humor. He is at once too stiff, too delicate, and too damned resolved to throw himself out of joint; and he is naturally embarrassed by the part itself, which is unsympathetic and humanly unlikely. In spite of the overdone rows of the first part (leading the way to higher planes in pictures, Shaw introduces a terror-of-water and bathtub wheeze), Wendy Hiller makes a lovely gutter girl and gradually fine lady, and her it-was-my-belief-they-done-her-in scene is the one high-comedy touch in the film. But generally it runs on and on like old Mis' Beamish in to borrow a cup of cookin' butter on a busy morning, and I swan to Betsy if I haven't forgot what 'twas I come for.

If you want a good picture and fun too, you can go see "The Beachcomber." Erich Pommer made the picture from Maugham's "Vessel of Wrath"; and while Charles Laughton, Elsa Lanchester, Robert Newton and Tyrone Guthrie dominate the visual play by filling out its characters, this is a show where the camera, the framing and handling of scenes, the music (by Richard Addinsell) and the writing, all brought their special skill to the total effect. Especially the writing, because that is where the whole good idea comes from: the English stewbum on one of the more obscure Dutch East Indies who keeps up his brazen-furtive league with the Controleur against the two Church-of-England missionaries between jail sentences, and winds up regenerating the missionaries and himself too. B. Van Thal's adaptation is part of it, for there is good balance in the scenes and continuity along a straight line, and the waste-not-want-not sententiousness of the missionary brother and sister is used to the best effect in hilarity throughout.

A thing like this, beachcombers to end beachcombing, soul-savers at the height of caricature, gin and jungle and sweat and blacks, could so easily have got out of hand that it is a wonder they made it so delicately, both in the nearly imperceptible sentiment and in the frank and joyous semi-bawdy. The brother waves nervously about in the breeze, a cross between a homo and the Holy Ghost; the sister is a mixture of your high-school algebra teacher, Florence Nightingale, the original thousand virgins and unfolding womanhood (too late); and Laughton himself gets into his part with such relish you can nearly smell him. And yet with all this seeming excess there is such restraint in emphasis all around that the most comic situation or utterance seems the only natural outcome of such a character under such circumstances, so that there is something touching in the ridiculous and vice versa.

For loveliness catching you unawares, you have the scene where Laughton has got his black girl and is drinking and dreaming and telling her how you can see your breath in the air and how your shoes ring in the snow like bells, back home, in England. And for the funniest entrance contrived anywhere this year you have the brother, who has huffed himself off into his room and been forgotten about in the following news of epidemic, bouncing back in to drape around his sister's neck: Martha, I apologize, and the look on their several faces. To a fair degree it is Charles Laughton's picture, and he is all through it grand. But the timing and motion of the more complex parts, not only the shift of body or camera but the holding back of the unexpected until the right split second for its explosion, the swift completion of the appointed round, are a lesson for all to study in the difference between hitting the nail on the head and hitting your head on the nail.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of course part of the blessing of this film is its unbound appreciation of some joys of life to which the movies are making us rapidly unaccustomed. But in a larger way it is a reassurance that true comedy lives as it always has had to live, full of people and motion and the things we know, exaggerated to make us laugh, surely, but never so narrow or meanly cerebral as to leave us with a dry throat or a bad taste in it: comedy should be near enough to us in honest familiar warmth to make us in some way happy.

The movies, which were after Mr. Bernard Shaw's time, left Mr. Bernard Shaw building houses out of alphabet blocks, but not in his first childhood. OTIS FERGUSON

The Bandwagon

The process of erasing all traces of Jewish influence continued with the removal of signs from eighty Vienna streets named for Jews, as well as of statuary and other commemorations of once honored Jews.

Among those whose memory is to be eradicated is Joseph Sonnenfels, who was responsible for the abolition of torture as a method of police investigation. – *News item in The New York Times.*

If you cut the price of [football] tickets to ten cents you'll have so many people at the football games that you won't be able to take care of them. Everybody who can't afford to go now will be able to go and who are the critics going to give the seats to then? They'll have to favor somebody and they'll set up class discrimination. – *Robert C. Zuppke, the University of Illinois football coach, quoted in The Chicago Tribune.*

But while the labor groups are insistent that public officers permit "public sentiment" or other politically derived factors to govern their decisions and rulings on points of law, the conservatives inside and outside Congress have never championed that point of view. – *David Lawrence in his syndicated column.*

The Republican Manifesto

Taxation based on the ability to pay was characterized as a "Communistic idea" by W. Barclay Lex, counsel for the Committee of Seventy, in challenging the validity of the 1½-percent income-tax ordinance before the Supreme Court today. – *From a news item in The Philadelphia Evening Public Ledger.*

Coals-to-Newcastle Department

Lady Suzanne Wilkins will accompany her explorer-husband, Sir Hubert Wilkins, on his under-sea dash to the Antarctic next year, she said in Los Angeles where she entrained for New York. Here she will select sables and ermines to be tailored into garments for polar wear. – *From The New York World-Telegram.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column and $1 will be paid for each item used. Address The Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. – THE EDITORS

A Communication

"I Accuse . . ."

SIR: Your readers may be interested in the enclosed document. It was written last spring, shortly after the seizure of Austria by Germany. Several liberal-minded weeklies in Great Britain refused it with regret. It was then decided to print it privately for distribution among friends and acquaintances. But this plan was never carried out.

A well known firm of British printers, who had done much work for me in recent years, refused even to submit an estimate for it. The text was then submitted to an attorney, who assured us that there was no legal objection of any kind to its being printed. However, another firm of printers with whom he had contact refused to handle it. So did a third, which had been connected with my family for three generations. In each case, an unlimited indemnity was offered to cover any possible loss that the printer might incur.

New York City PHYLLIS BOTTOME

[Enclosure]

I accuse the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Primate of the Church of England, of culpable credulity in his statement to the House of Lords, in which he quotes the letter of an Austrian friend, as filled with joy over the German military occupation of Austria.

Does not the Archbishop know that he could receive no other letter than one upholding the crime of the Nazis, since all letters are censored by the criminals themselves, and only those allowed through that support their crimes?

Does not the Archbishop know that so-called suicides in Vienna are taking place at the rate of a hundred a week?

Does the Archbishop, Head of the Church of England, have no pity for the race from which the Founder of his own religion sprang?

Can any Christian accept lightly the fate of the 200,000 Jews in Vienna who are being systematically pillaged and tortured and the further 600,000 half-Jews, who are in danger of being deprived of their livelihood if they remain, or of 75 percent of their fortune if they leave Austria? (Note: this was subsequently increased to 92 percent. – P. B.)

What further proof does any sensible man need that Austria desired to keep her integrity than Hitler's refusal to allow her a free vote upon it?

Does the Archbishop suppose that a vote under an armed force *is* free?

The worth of an opinion lies in the person who maintains it.

We the people of Great Britain have a right to demand *who* these mysterious strangers are, who communicate with our Prime Minister from Rome and with our Archbishop from Vienna.

We shall no doubt be told that: "It is not a matter of public interest that their names should be mentioned." But it is surely of public interest that the information of these mysterious strangers should not be misleading.

I accuse Lord Halifax of invincible ignorance, for stating in the House of Lords that he sees no reason to believe in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the sinister intentions of the German government, while Spanish towns are being bombed to pieces by German airmen, whose fellow countrymen sit on the Non-Intervention Committee.

I accuse the Prime Minister of being publicly cited in a German newspaper as "Germany's man," and of having deserved this insult.

I accuse the "Cliveden set" of money-conditioned thinking, in that they are deliberately using their great wealth and the power of the press which they help to control, to hand England over to the dictators in order to save their skins and their pockets.

I accuse the present government of forsaking her natural allies, all free and democratic countries, but most especially France, America and those countries which have a right to look to England for moral as well as protective leadership, in order to curry favor with forces inimical to our birthright of freedom.

I accuse those who govern England of perfidy and cowardice, and of a blind arrogance that will dig her doom.

I accuse our press, with a few honorable exceptions, of having given up their liberty of free speech under the guise of "a gentleman's agreement." This is more than a mere political situation; it is a moral question; and all British people with consciences or with courage have a right and a duty to take part in it.

I accuse our present government and the Primate of the Church of England of paltering with their consciences in making friends with the Mammon of Unrighteousness, and of trying to juggle with the conscience of England, by throwing away our responsibility as human beings to our brother man.

PHYLLIS BOTTOME

Correspondence

Books That Changed Our Minds

SIR: Your symposia on the books that have influenced and molded thought in the past thirty years or so [The New Republic, December 7 and 21] are instructive and interesting, but will you pardon a suggestion? At times, as you know, certain general ideas are "in the air," and several or many books simultaneously express and reflect those ideas. It may be difficult, and indeed unfair, to give some single volume the credit for a significant result attributable in reality to a number of books, articles and lectures. Why not ask, or permit, contributors to refer to certain sets of books, for example?

To illustrate the point: Many of us are firm and convinced pragmatists, but we cannot say that Professor Dewey converted us to that modern philosophy, or *Weltanschauung*. The present writer owes *his* pragmatism to quite a group of thinkers—Peirce, James, Dewey, Mead and Tufts. James's essays, to be sure, were the first he read on the subject, but other writers elaborated and clarified the points gleaned from James. . . .

Let us bear in mind that events, as well as books and general ideas, mold and change our thinking. What friend of the Russian revolution has not been impressed, or educated, by the developments in Moscow of the last few years? We hear a good deal about the disappointment and disillusionment of liberals and radicals the world over by reason of the Russian purges, trials, violations of the new constitution, continued complaints of urban populations still denied ordinary creature comforts, and the like. We do not hear as much about the lessons, mainly negative, to be taken to heart, the necessity of avoiding certain courses and policies pursued by the Soviet Union. Perhaps a symposium on the "Events That Have Influenced Me" would be as revealing and illuminating as that on outstanding and thought-provoking books.

Lewis Institute, Chicago, Ill. VICTOR S. YARROS

SIR: In writing of books that changed our minds, have you given consideration to the occasional seminal passage which packs a wallop out of all proportion to the rest of the book?

Authors are usually disappointingly spotty to me. When I was a boy I was impressed with the career and program of Woodrow Wilson and I read his books, all of them, religiously. They were, for the most part, ordinary. Good, yes, but not remarkable. Only one book of his, "When a Man Comes to Himself," took hold of me and worked the kind of change in my mind that you are discussing. And it was only a part of that book, only a few pages.

Oliver Wendell Holmes has mentioned the "ovarian" ideas which men are privileged to hit upon once in a lifetime or so. I have run across such ideas in the most unexpected places—and failed to find them where I most confidently expected them. In me, the Army War College pamphlet, "Estimating the Situation," effected mental detonation. Somewhere, in the old World, I think, I have seen a column by Heywood Broun that seemed to me to be the whole gospel. Broun is especially unpredictable: ordinarily he is just good, easy reading. . . .

The vital part of even the most revolutionary book is likely to be found in some dozen or so pages and the rest is just elaboration—padding even. It is true I suppose that the dynamic part is indistinguishable, even to the author (or especially to the author in many cases) from the so-so stuff. Readers and writers must just bog along in the dark and be glad if they get an occasional fitful lightning flash.

Coast Guard Depot, Curtis Bay, Md. MANUEL BOY FRANK

SIR: May a recent college graduate list the books that changed his mind—provisionally, at least—during the formative years: "The Autobiography of Lincoln Steffens"; "The Magic Mountain" by Thomas Mann; Veblen's "Theory of the Leisure Class"; Randall's "Making of the Modern Mind" and "Middletown" by the Lynds.

. . . The "depression-educated" graduate of today, I think, experienced a shift in the orientation of his thinking from an esthetic to an economic and social norm. Most of us entered the depression as good middle-class conservatives and graduated as good middle-class liberals—not so dangerous as before, it is true, but a good deal more futile. The book is yet to be written that will make radicals out of liberals.

In revaluing "Books That Changed Our Mind" why not draw up a list of "prunings" or "culls"—stars that have set, so to speak. What has happened to H. G. Wells, Cabell, Mencken, *et al.*? At one time, really, their trumpets blew a loud and fearsome note.

New York City DAVID DEMPSEY

Father Coughlin and the Pope

SIR: Inept and untimely was the radio broadcast of Father Coughlin in which he admonished the Jews on Communism, and equally inept and untimely was its pugnacious defense by Mr. Patrick Scanlan, editor of The Brooklyn Tablet. It is to be hoped the Jews of America will consider both cases not in the light of anti-Semitism but rather as two cases of extraordinarily bad manners. Both publicists have, moreover, unfortunately put themselves in the position before a considerable

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

number of the American people of seeming to say what, as a matter of fact, they did not say, and of seeming to be what, as Catholics, they cannot be, according to Pope Pius XI, anti-Semitic. Both editors, as a matter of fact, found it necessary to deny the interpretation which was, not unnaturally, placed upon their actions. . . .

In order to give as wide publicity as possible to the only tenable position that Catholics may take in regard to the venomous thing which is anti-Semitism, we publish a declaration pronounced by the Holy Father. He was speaking before a group of Belgian radio-station directors.

The Sovereign Pontiff cited the text of the Canon of the Mass said daily by Catholic priests the world over, in which the sacrifice of Abel, of Abraham and Melchisedech are linked with the sacrifice of Jesus. He said:

Sacrifice of Abel, sacrifice of Abraham, sacrifice of Melchisedech. In three acts, in three links, in three stages, behold the whole religious history of humanity. Sacrifice of Abel; era of Adam. Sacrifice of Abraham; era of religion and wonderful history of Israel. Sacrifice of Melchisedech; announcement of the Christian era and religion.

Noblest of texts! Each time We read it We are overcome with an inexpressible emotion.

Sacrificium Patriarchae Nostri Abrahae (Sacrifice of Abraham, our Patriarch). Note well how Abraham is called our patriarch, our ancestor.

Anti-Semitism is *not compatible with the thought and sublime realities which are expressed in this text. It is a movement to which we cannot, we Christians, have any part whatsoever.*

Concerning the promise made to Abraham and his descendants, the text does not say, Saint Paul remarks, "in *Seeds*, meaning plural, but in the *Seed*, meaning one which is Christ" (*in seminibus, tamquam in pluribus, sed in semine, tamquam in uno, quod est Christus*). Through Christ and in Christ we are the *spiritual descendants of Abraham.* No, it is not possible for Christians to participate in anti-Semitism. We acknowledge the right of everyone to defend himself, to take legitimate measures to protect himself against all that menaces his legitimate interests. *But anti-Semitism is inadmissible. Spiritually, we are Semites.*

THE CATHOLIC WORKER

New York City

Free the Harlan Miners!

SIR: I am sure your readers need not be told the facts in the frame-up of the four Harlan County union miners who are still serving life terms as a result of the infamous trials arising from the Battle of Evarts in 1931. The hearings before the La Follette Committee and the revelations during the 1938 federal trials of the coal operators amply corroborate the fury of Harlan's anti-labor forces. But I want to enlist their aid in our drive to obtain pardons for these men this Christmas.

We have held two pardon hearings before Governor Chandler, the last in June, 1938, at which overwhelming evidence of intimidation and perjury was presented. We have also filed petitions from forty-six of the forty-seven surviving jurors and letters from two of the three trial judges asking for the release of the men. But the Governor has not reached a decision.

It will help him to make up his mind if your readers will write or wire Governor A. B. Chandler, Frankfort, Kentucky, asking for immediate unconditional pardons. Contributions for the Christmas Pardon Fund can be sent to Kentucky Miners' Defense, 75 Fifth Avenue, New York City. Every letter and every penny will bring these four innocent victims of Harlan County coal operators' despotism nearer their families, who have been without them for nearly eight years.

HERBERT MAHLER, Secretary-Treasurer,
Kentucky Miners' Defense

New York City

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Morris L. Ernst writes from New York City on another point of contention with Dr. Lehmann, author of the series, "The Catholic Church in Politics." Dr. Lehmann said (December 7, page 125): "The most convincing arguments for family limitation and child spacing are to be found in the 'Rhythm' publications. . . . These books are widely distributed through the United States mails with Postmaster General Farley's approval, though birth-control literature is still unmailable." Mr. Ernst argues: "Under court decisions and Post Office Department rulings a tremendous amount of birth-control information and articles are sent through the mails to druggists, doctors and others in health groups. The point might be made by Lehmann indicating that books like 'Rhythm' can go to the ultimate consumer, whereas advertisements of pessaries can only go through the channels of medical and health advice."

C. E. Payne of Ruby, Washington, objects to the space we gave Paul Weiss to review John Dewey's "Logic" (November 23). "Both Weiss and Dewey are 'illogical.' There is memory and there is comparison, but there is no logic. What is called logic is a string of words with no meaning." . . . Franklin E. Schlueter of Two Rivers, Wisconsin, regrets the omission of books on religion in the list of "One Hundred Notable Books: 1938" (December 7). He would have included "The Church through the Centuries," by Cyril Charles Richardson, "Christianity and Economics," by Sir Josiah Stamp, "The Church and the Christian," by Shailer Mathews, "Contemporary Continental Theology," by Walter Marshall Horton, and "The Thousand Years of Uncertainty," by Kenneth Scott Latourette. . . . Mark Starr of New York City has pointed out an error in the title we gave him in the correspondence section of the December 14 issue. He is the Educational Director of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union and not its Publicity Director.

Grace Robinson of Takoma Park, Maryland, says that the editorial, "Jim Crow Education" (November 30), is misleading as far as the District of Columbia is concerned. "Although Negroes in the city of Washington attend separate schools, they have exactly the same advantages that white pupils enjoy. Their school officials and teachers are on the same salary schedule and their instruction, books and regulations are the same."

What's on the Air?

Dr. James T. Shotwell of Columbia University speaks on "Woodrow Wilson's Place in History," Wednesday, December 28, 5 P.M., CBS.

Mark Sullivan and Jay Franklin speak on "The Public Interest in Democracy," Wednesday, December 28, 10:30 P.M., NBC-Blue Network.

Business men representing nine of America's leading industries discuss the "Business Outlook for 1939," Thursday, December 29, 8:30 P.M., NBC-Blue Network.

Musical and dramatic programs of the week include "Lucia di Lammermoor," by the Metropolitan Opera Company, Saturday, December 24, 1:55 P.M., NBC-Red Network; a dramatization of the life of Fred Banting, discoverer of insulin, Saturday, December 24, 9 P.M., CBS; Sistine Chapel Choir, Sunday, December 25, 1 P.M., CBS; the New York Philharmonic, Sunday, December 25, 3 P.M., CBS; Bach Cantata, Sunday, December 25, 7 P.M., Mutual; "Hansel and Gretel" by the Metropolitan Opera, Monday, December 26, 2 P.M., NBC-Blue Network; Indianapolis Symphony, Wednesday, December 28, 3 P.M., CBS; and "Twelve Crowded Months," dramatization of the most important news-events of the year, Saturday, December 31, 6:30 P.M., CBS.

All times given are Eastern Standard Time.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

Lord of These Elements

MOST OF THE BOOKS about Leonardo are written in terms of a vague and almost incoherent rapture, as if his works were beyond the power of human thought to conceive or simple words to express. Leonardo might have been flattered, but his cold and lucid mind would have abhorred such vagueness. His motto was "obstinate rigor" —*hostinato rigore*—and one of the aims that he always kept in sight was to find the underlying principles of each phenomenon, by which it is united to the rest of the natural world. It seems to me that anyone who writes about him is obligated to seek for the underlying principles of this human phenomenon that was never repeated in nature.

For the last thirty of forty years of his life, he kept a private record of his ideas and undertakings. After reading the complete translation of his "Notebooks,"[1] as arranged under fifty topical headings and published in two big handsome volumes with a preface by Edward MacCurdy, one has a much clearer idea of why he was called "the universal man." One can even make a catalogue of his accomplishments, much as they were catalogued by Leonardo himself in a famous letter to Lodovico Sforza. Thus—

He was first of all an artist—that is, a great painter and draftsman, a theorist and teacher of painting, a sculptor, an architect, a musician (and inventor of musical instruments), a writer of fables and, on occasion, a poet.

He was a scientist—that is, a mathematician, a physicist (making original researches into optics, acoustics, mechanics, hydraulics and aerodynamics), an astronomer, a geologist, an amateur chemist, a really superb anatomist, a physiologist, a zoölogist, a botanist, a geographer.

He was an engineer—civil, military, industrial, hydraulic and sanitary—besides being a cartographer and a town planner.

He was an inventor of labor-saving machinery—looms, presses, rolling mills, water mills, wind mills. He also invented or foresaw new engines of war, including shrapnel, submarines, tanks, poison gas and the airplane.

He was a courtier, a designer and decorator of princely fêtes, an illusionist, a master of ceremonies.

He was a natural philosopher with an extraordinarily clear conception of scientific method—that is, of *controlled* experiments leading to *mathematical* demonstrations and designed to reveal the principles of *necessity* and *continuity* throughout the universe.

In short, he invented tools of thought by which nature could be analyzed and resolved into its elements, and these elements combined into new constructions of every type—paintings, philosophies, palaces, cities, canals, bridges, a whole civilization which he was equally prepared to destroy by carefully planned battles, sieges and artificial floods. Under his eyes the substantial world became fluid and continually capable of assuming different shapes. No wonder that Edward MacCurdy, after poring over his manuscripts for twenty-five years, exclaimed that they are "the records of the working of the mightiest machine perhaps that has ever been a human brain." No wonder that his own contemporaries regarded him as a magician.

The question that strikes me after reading the "Notebooks," and even more after reading the biography by Antonina Vallentin, which helps to explain them and which I hope to discuss next week—the real question is whether Leonardo did not also regard himself as a magician. In that case, he could look to an honorable line of predecessors and rivals. During the Middle Ages and the early Renaissance, every scientist or philosopher was suspected of dabbling in the black arts. Albertus Magnus was a magician, so was Friar Bacon and so, in Leonardo's day, were Johann Faustus, Paracelsus and a host of others. Magic was almost a recognized profession, like medicine or the Church. And it was a profession likely to attract a young man like Leonardo, who despised his fellow creatures, who wanted to rise above them, who was in fact so dominated by ambition that he was no longer content with creating even the greatest works of art, and yet was too humble in his origins to hope for success in war and statecraft. Instead he aspired to grasp the inmost secret of things. "I want to work miracles," he exclaimed—*voglio far miracoli.*

We are venturing here into a realm where everything is conjecture. But if it be true that Leonardo's conception of himself was colored by the Renaissance picture of how a great magician should behave, then many of his actions fall into a recognizable pattern. We know, for example, that he lived a solitary life with his apprentices, that he walked the streets in rich but outlandish clothes, that he sometimes spent money lavishly while hiding the sources of his income, as if it came straight from the Devil. We know that he was secretly hostile to the Church. We know that his genius was mingled with more than a trace of charlatanism; that he liked to raise the hair of his guests with a collection of chemical and mechanical horrors (see his directions in Vol. II, p. 156, "for making a fire which shall set a large room in a blaze without doing any harm"). Many Florentines believed he had made a pact with the powers of darkness.

There is of course another side to the picture. Leonardo was full of contempt for "the alchemists, the would-be creators of gold and silver . . . and those supreme fools the necromancer and the enchanter." The miracles he worked were real miracles; the philosopher's stone he sought and found was the true scientific method. He went so far in applying it that his Notebooks foreshadow a whole series of scientific principles and discoveries; not only those of Harvey and Galileo, but also those of the late nineteenth century and perhaps—who knows?—of the future.

Yet in another sense he remains closer to the magicians of his own time. We think of the true scientist as being engaged in a coöperative and collective struggle to extend the boundaries of human knowledge. Discoveries made in Paris or Berlin are verified in California and applied, per-

[1] The Notebooks of Leonardo de Vinci, edited and translated with an introduction by Edward MacCurdy. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock. 2 vols. 1,295 pages with 64 plates. $15.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

haps, in the interior of China. But the magician worked by and for himself, and so did Leonardo. He sometimes thought of publishing the results of his experiments, and he even completed one manuscript, a "Treatise on Speech," which was lost by the Pope's privy chamberlain. But his impulse toward imparting his knowledge was canceled by another impulse toward keeping it secret, toward making it perfect and utterly his own. At heart he was Faustian rather than Promethean. When he tried to snatch the secret of the gods, his aim was not to benefit humanity—which could perish for all he cared—but rather to make himself godlike. It was as if he had listened throughout his life to the voice of Dr. Faustus' Evil Angel, with his praise of knowledge as individual power:

> Go forward, Faustus, in that famous art
> Wherein all Nature's treasure is contained:
> Be thou on earth as Jove is in the sky,
> Lord and commander of these elements.

MALCOLM COWLEY

Jim Farley: Soldier and Artist

Behind the Ballots: The Personal History of a Politician, by James A. Farley. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 392 pages. $3.

OURS IS a relatively literate administration. Several of the Cabinet, including Mr. Ickes, Mr. Wallace and Mr. Cummings, have turned authors; and of the Little Cabinet, Thurman Arnold and Jerome Frank and Harry Hopkins, in addition to throwing minor frights into dowagers every morning at breakfast, write books that give the whole family a major scare periodically. And, of course, there are the writing Roosevelts, husband and wife. But Jim Farley as author is something novel—and delectable. Jim has been, on and off, the biggest breakfast bogey of them all. He has been damned by the radicals and intellectuals for a hand-shaking Babbitt. He has been scorched by the reactionaries as a grafter and a tyrant. And the liberals have pointed their finger at him as the Sinister Side of the New Deal. Now Jim has dared write a book, and has placed his life in our hands.

It is an engaging book and an engaging life. It is the sort of book that would have delighted Lincoln Steffens. For whatever else may be said of Jim Farley, he has not a tithe of the hypocrisy of the Republicans who attack him, and he lacks the smugness and cant of the reformers. He is proud to be a politician. He delights in recounting his methods and his rewards. He knows he has come far in the world. A poor Irish boy, of a line of peasants and day-laborers—a boy who worked in the brickyards and tended bar in his mother's saloon and later got eight dollars a week as a bookkeeper, is now a dispenser of jobs and patronage to hundreds of thousands. The political heeler who started by ringing doorbells at Grassy Point, New York, and who trembled when he reached the heights of an audience with Al Smith or Boss Murphy, is now a political mover and shaker, creator and confidant of Governors, Senators, Presidents. Jim Farley has made good, and this book (whoever may have helped write it) is his utterly unselfconscious success story.

It is the pre-convention campaign of 1932 that looms largest in his mind and book. In 1930, when the Roosevelt forces began preparing the presidential build-up, Farley was New York State Boxing Commissioner, and a second-string politician. In 1932, after the convention, he was the acknowledged field-marshal of the national Democratic forces, hailed as an organizing genius by veteran politicians. The credit for the 1932 victory, both at the convention and at the polls, must go to one of the greatest trio of generals in the history of campaigning—Roosevelt, Farley and Louis Howe. There never was a stranger assortment than these three made—the smiling and confident patrician who knew how to reach the common man, certain of his star even when he was hazy as to what he would hitch to it; the tall, massive, Irish building-supply salesman who could talk to the run of political heelers and "leaders" because his mentality was theirs, only raised to the *n*th power of shrewdness and drive; the gnome-like little newspaper reporter, his hundred pounds of body racked by asthma, devious, cunning, a lilliputian Warwick dominated by the single idea of making his "Franklin" President. In a sense, of this trio, one was the front-man, one the leg-man, one the behind-the-scenes man.

The most important story in the book is the account of the way in which the Garner delegations in Texas and California, which held the key to the 1932 nomination, were won over to Roosevelt. Farley says everything was aboveboard: that there were no "deals," that Hearst had nothing to do with it, that Garner feared to jeopardize the Democratic chances by continuing a bitter-end deadlock in the convention, and released his delegates through Sam Rayburn without any promise having been made about the vice-presidency. The ingenuousness of this is retrieved somewhat by Farley's admission that there was a tacit "understanding" about the vice-presidency between Rayburn and himself, although no words passed to confirm it. Logicians interested in intuition and the transcendental would do well to make a study of convention politics.

There is a good deal more "inside stuff" in the book. I suspect that for every decision to tell all, Farley made five more to keep his peace and to convert the book (in Mr. Dooley's phrase) into "a hitching-post for his silences." But what there is makes a rich enough harvest: that Al Smith, for example, never said "Hello, you old potato" to Roosevelt in the 1932 reconciliation scene, but that the phrase was contributed gratis by a reporter; that Roosevelt and Martin Conboy, his counsel, had not reached any conclusions about Jimmy Walker's guilt or innocence when Walker resigned; that Paul McNutt fought Roosevelt bitterly at the 1932 convention and was not scrupulous in his methods; that Huey Long was the *enfant terrible* of the Roosevelt forces at the convention, almost wrecking them by his exuberance; that his plan for his own role in the campaign was to be given a special train, equipped with loud speakers, and swing around the forty-eight states promising immediate payment of the soldiers' bonus. The best story in the book is the one about Huey Long's hat. Huey was chafing at the delay in getting his share of the spoils in the form of federal appointments for his men. He determined either to break the President or break with him. The climax came at a White House interview, during the better part of which the blustering Kingfish kept his bright-ribboned straw

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hat on in the President's presence. The President was cool, smiling, perfectly aware of what was going on, and quietly firm. Finally Huey took his hat off and kept it off. At the end of the interview he said to Farley, "What the hell is the use of coming down to see this fellow? I can't win any decision over him." Yet before Long's death Roosevelt was worried enough about him. Farley conducted a secret poll indicating that Long would get between three and four million votes running as an independent, fairly well distributed over the country and enough to hold the balance of power in 1936 and elect a Republican. And he learned also that there were "Hate Roosevelt" financial moguls who were ready to put up the money for Long's campaign.

There are other items as interesting, if less momentous: that when the "philatelic scandal" broke and Farley was accused of handing out special stamp issues to friends he could have shown from Post Office records that Republican bigwigs had always gotten valuable stamp handouts, but decided it was more generous and also better politics at the time to keep quiet; that Roosevelt draws sketches for many of the stamp designs himself; that the Mother's Day stamp was drawn by him, with Whistler's picture as a model, but that in the process of revision at the Bureau of Engravings a vase of flowers had to be added and the mother's feet subtracted, bringing irate letters from Whistlerites on both scores; that Emil Hurja, the wizard ballot-sampler of the Democrats, was way off in 1936, predicting only 376 electoral votes, while Farley guessed dead right; that Roosevelt asked Farley to assure Senator Robinson in the midst of the Supreme Court fight that the Van Devanter vacancy was his but that the appointment could not be made immediately; that the President has not made up his mind about a third term, and is too smart to talk about it now.

Farley loves politics, and is almost a pure artist at it. I call him a pure artist because his art is unobscured and unhindered by considerations of substance. It was sheer and ironic accident that made him the political generalissimo of the New Deal. Had the cards fallen differently, he might with greater comfort have devoted his talents to a Republican or a conservative Democrat. For there is scarcely a breath in the book of the substance of politics—of program and social forces, of revolution and reaction, of labor and capital and the middle class—what the younger group around Mr. Roosevelt calls the "politics of principle." Farley is sometimes likened to Mark Hanna, but in one respect the similarity falls down. It is true that Farley, like Hanna in his day, modernized the political campaign and applied business methods to it—the build-up, the "deals," the salesman treks across the continent, the systematic coverage of minor "leaders," the large-scale "personal touch," the sample polls, the network of reports and communiqués, the elaborate espionage system. Yet in Hanna the capitalist outweighed the politician. His politics was in his own sense a politics of principle—capitalist principle. Farley's is much more a devotion to forms and traditions of the political game.

It is all mimic warfare for him, like the battles of the Norse gods in Valhalla: after the day's fighting their wounds were healed and they all sat down amiably to supper. Farley's politics has the same sporting spirit—like football or boxing. His words indicate that he actually thinks of himself as a prize-fight manager, and the President as the most valuable fighter in his string. His conception of convention politics is in the sporting tradition; it is chessboard politics, requiring concentration and finesse, but the counters that are moved about have only the symbolic value that attaches to victory or defeat (I am not forgetting the patronage system, which Farley is frank in defending—but he is not venal), and none of the substantive values upon which in the social struggle victory and defeat themselves depend for meaning. Set his account, for example, beside the account of a Democratc convention in Matthew Josephson's "Politicos" or Herbert Agar's "Pursuit of Happiness": being moralists, they see the formal hollowness and the hidden social meanings; being a political technician, Farley sees the formal beauties and does not look beyond.

It is from this angle that we may approach two present facts, otherwise paradoxical, about Farley's relation to Roosevelt and his loyalty to the President and his increasing coldness for the New Deal. Farley has been a good soldier persistently. He has followed orders, and often taken the rap. Bryan had no Farley, nor had Woodrow Wilson, and the measure of their lack was in part the measure of their failure. A Farley is an essential transition figure. No party can move toward the democratic collectivism which is America's manifest destiny without keeping its rear protected and its lines of communication with the past well open. Farley, with his middle-class mentality added to his craftsman's sense of the job has filled that function.

But that same middle-class mentality and that same craftsman's sense are now elements of danger to the New Deal. Farley, for all his discretion in the book, is plainly anguished by the President's drastic persistence in his reform aims. Surely Mr. Roosevelt and his advisers are too much in earnest to play the game well, are taking risks disproportionate to the political rewards, are even endangering Farley's big sacred cow—Party Unity. The story of the last few years is tossed off with a casualness, a discontinuity, a studied aversion to saying much, that show clearly Jim's heart is not in it. The mood of the last pages betrays a sense of almost tragic conflict—between the demands of the good soldier which tell him to remain loyal, and the demands of the craftsman in politics which tell him that Roosevelt and his advisers are allowing considerations of social policy to intrude themselves into the domain of pure politics.

If Farley should follow "Jack" Garner, whom he fervently admires, and break with the administration, what would be the consequence? In one sense, he is already part of the past. The New Deal has also a new politics, which every future administration will have to copy. It is the politics of the deed. In place of Farley's classical allegiance to the patronage system as he has always understood it, there is the politics of relief and the WPA and social security and labor legislation, and grants-in-aid to the states, and farm subsidies and public works. There is little in the book about this politics, for Jim Farley was not brought up to it. Events move fast. Six years ago he was an innovator. Today there are new men for new methods—a Hopkins, an Ickes, a Wallace, a Lilienthal, above all a Corcoran. What Jim Farley must think of these *novi homines,* and how eloquent are his silences about them! His place in history will be most clearly understood when an attempt is made to find a Farley for the new politics. But before that happens much else will have happened that Jim Farley will never understand.

MAX LERNER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lest We Forget

The Decline and Fall of the British Empire, by Robert Briffault. New York: Simon and Schuster. 272 pages. $2.

THE PHENOMENA of the decline of empires are the subject of sociologists contemporary thereto. The fact of the fall is usually reserved for the future historian to determine. Gibbon could justify his famous title in respect to the Roman Empire by two dates, 476 and 1453, and President McKinley might boast of closing out the Spanish Empire in 1898. Mr. Briffault lacks a similar definitive conclusion, though he would doubtless regard the Munich agreement of 1938 as affording temporary terminal facilities. Evidence of decline, however, he accumulates to give a momentum which leaves the final catastrophe in little doubt.

Mr. Briffault calls the British Empire meteoric in view of its actual beginnng in 1760, when the plunder of India supplied the capital by virtue of which England took full advantage of the industrial revolution. His thesis is that since that time the main preoccupation of the English ruling class has been to maintain its privileged position under capitalism. In this effort it attacked the French Revolution, which in its beginning sought to imitate the limited monarchy of England, and supported reaction in Europe. With the rise of the socialist state in the Soviet Union this preoccupation became an obsession, which has caused repeated surrender to the Fascist powers, and "the systematic sacrifice of national interests to the promotion and support of the general cause of reaction against the menace of social change." It was not a disinterested regard for peace that led Mr. Chamberlain to Munich, but a conviction that war would result in social revolution.

YOU HAVE A DATE WITH ALMA MATER
She's going modern at the
HIPPODROME
STUDENT RALLY AND JAMBOREE OPENING
AMERICAN STUDENT UNION 4th NAT'L CONVENTION
Speakers: The HON. SHERIDAN F. DOWNEY, Senator Elect from California; Nelson P. Mead, Acting President of CCNY; Joseph P. Lash, Executive Secretary of the A. S. U.
"UNAMERICANA," a new play on the Dies Committee by the authors of "Academic Epidemic." First produced at Cabaret Tac.
HIPPODROME, 43rd STREET AND SIXTH AVENUE
Tuesday, December 27, 8:00 P. M.
GUEST TICKETS, $1.10 STUDENT TICKETS, $.40
Tickets on Sale at: American Student Union, 112 E. 19th St., NYC.
New York University Book Shop.
Workers Book Shop.

CHRISTMAS BOOKSALE

★ PROGRESSIVE BOOKS
Make Permanent Gifts
Hundreds of titles: fiction, non-fiction, art books and fine art reproductions at savings up to 50%. Write for price list and catalogue. All books postpaid. We specialize in books on Labor, Socialism, Communism, U.S.S.R., Marxism-Leninism, American History, etc.
SALE ENDS JANUARY 9th
★ WORKERS BOOKSHOP
50 East 13th St., New York City
Tel. ALg. 4-6953

Mr. Briffault is mindful of Burke's maxim that it is impossible to draw an indictment against a whole nation. He insists that England affords an exception by virtue of the solidarity of its ruling class, promoted by the "public-school tie," the university, the church, and undisturbed by the penetration of ideas; and by reason of the complete subservience of middle and lower classes to the ideals of their rulers. This subservience is amply illustrated by the conduct of the general strike in 1926, and by the course of the British Labor Party under MacDonald and later.

Mr. Briffault has so good a case that he need not have supported it by overstatement. His rhetoric abounds in generalization and the superlative. He has a special contempt for the nineteenth century, during which the British Empire reached its apogee; but when he feels that he "may safely venture to assert that in the whole of English nineteenth-century creative literature will not be found one page, one sentence that may produce in the English reader the uncomfortable sensation of contact with reality," he might remember Disraeli's "Sybil" and Mrs. Gaskell's novels protesting against industrial conditions. Again, Mr. Briffault's assertion that "the condition of the workers thus improved through no effect either of benevolent legislation intended to that end or of any action on their own part," takes no account of the factory acts and the trade-union movement. To say that "there are everywhere else minds capable of throwing off the conditioning effects of reaction . . . not so in England," is to forget Charles Bradlaugh and Tom Mann.

Exaggeration may be pardoned to Mr. Briffault's enthusiasm for his cause, but this tolerance can scarcely be extended to misstatements of facts. Burke's "Reflections on the French Revolution" should not be attributed to 1789, when the movement was in its constitutional stage, but to its publication in November, 1790. The deportation of seven laborers for the crime of "combination" took place not in 1834, after the Reform Act, but in 1825, under the Tory government of Lord Liverpool. These slips are unimportant except as they add unnecessary emphasis to Briffault's thesis. They suggest haste, as if the author feared that "the fall" would anticipate his book in spite of the well known agility of his publishers.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT

Capitalism on the Sickbed

Seeds of Destruction, by John M. Blair. New York: Covici, Friede. 426 pages. $4.
Capitalism in Crisis, by James Harvey Rogers. New Haven: Yale University Press. 220 pages. $2.50.

MR. BLAIR has made a comprehensive objective survey of the functional weaknesses of contemporary capitalism. These arise, he demonstrates, from our failure to observe four basic axioms: "First, that capitalism must not cast out of employment a progressively increasing number of workers nor lower the relative wages of those employed; second, that capitalism must not progressively raise prices without correspondingly raising wages; third, that capitalism must not distribute a large portion of its income to the upper income groups; and fourth, that capitalism must be ever expanding." The author assembles impressive factual support for his major contention that capitalism is *compelled* to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

violate these axioms because of "aggravating trends" which our economy has acquired in the dynamics of its development. Their growth is critically examined and checked against all available statistical data. The evidence leans heavily in favor of the conclusion that capitalism must find it difficult if not impossible to fulfill its primary mission of distributing its goods to most of the people, most of the time.

Mr. Blair is perhaps most effective in his discussion of possible curative techniques. He sees that no real solution is possible without first lowering prices and raising wages so as to increase purchasing power. At the same time, he recognizes the difficulties involved. That they are seemingly insurmountable makes one wonder whether capitalism can do anything to protect its survival.

Professor James Harvey Rogers, the distinguished Yale economist and former monetary adviser to President Roosevelt, has written a short but incisive critique of capitalism, which serves as an excellent companion piece to Mr. Blair's more exhaustive treatise. Price inflexibility, saving and hoarding, budget-balancing, inflation and the surprising trend toward economic barriers between the states, are discussed broadly in terms of their impact on our economic life. Professor Rogers offers his list of "home remedies." He would (1) extend to all industry the Ford policy of passing production savings on to the consumer in the form of lower prices; (2) enlarge government spending to the extent that business spending lags, under a sane governmental policy of long-term balance; (3) quell state autarchy by proper federal legislation; (4) "somehow" reëstablish coöperation among business, labor and government; and (5) meet promptly by government action, the elemental needs of the underprivileged classes. Surely these are perspectives which all progressives can endorse. H. J BRESLER

New Books: A Reader's List

ADVENTURES OF AMERICA, 1857-1900, by John A. Kouwenhoven (Harpers, $3.50). Here are 256 of the most amusing or revealing topical pictures that appeared in old Harper's Weekly. With Mr. Kouwenhoven's text—written from the liberal side and peppered with odd bits of information—they make an informal social history of the forty-three years between the panic of 1857 and McKinley's second election. Among the artists represented are Nast, Abbey, Hassam, Remington and, best of all, Winslow Homer. A fine book to give or get at Christmas.

COWBOY SONGS AND OTHER FRONTIER BALLADS, collected by John A. Lomax and Alan Lomax (Macmillan, $3.75). A mixture of cowboy ballads that were sung (with the tunes they were sung to) and cowboy ballads that were merely recited. Most of the latter seem pretty dull when read in one's easy chair instead of being drawled at the edge of a campfire, but many of the songs would be marvelous in any setting. This is a revised and enlarged edition of a famous collection that first appeared in 1911. Keep it near your piano.

TALES OF A WAYWARD INN, by Frank Case (Stokes, $3). Reminiscences and anecdotes about home life at the Algonquin, told engagingly by the man who runs it. Reveals less about the workings of hotel machinery than Sinclair Lewis in "Work of Art," but more about celebrities than "Who's Who" and a series of gossip columns. An appendix of thank-you notes from distinguished guests.

by
Corliss Lamont

48 PAGES
A SUMMARY OF SIX YEARS' STUDY and OBSERVATION

5¢
postpaid

It Answers Your Questions!

Every informed person owes it to himself to read this unusual presentation of the whole story of Soviet progress and achievement told with authority, brevity and lucidity by Dr. Corliss Lamont. This pamphlet will explain how, in the present tense world situation, the Soviets are working to check fascist aggression and preserve peace. The pamphlet based upon years of study and two extensive visits to the USSR tells you exactly what you want to know about the Soviet Union; answers your questions. It is a remarkable work which will give you a clear understanding of the political, social and economic aspects of one-sixth of the world. Tells more in 48 pages than many large volumes.

We will mail you a copy postpaid for 5c or a bundle of 25 copies for distribution among your friends for only $1.00. Regular discounts to dealers.

SOVIET RUSSIA TODAY
114 East 32nd Street Dept. R. S. New York, N. Y.

NEW YEARS EVE SATURDAY, DEC. 31ST

"RED INDIAN" DANCE

(WE FURNISH THE FEATHERS)

IN A REAL INDIAN VILLAGE

MANHATTAN OPERA HOUSE
34TH STREET AND 8TH AVENUE
ADMISSION: $1.10 IN ADVANCE ★ $1.50 AT THE DOOR
Auspices: N.Y. STATE COMMUNIST PARTY ★ TICKETS: WORKERS BOOKSHOP 50 E. 13th and 35 E. 125th St. 3rd FLOOR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Correction

A linotype slug, transposed just as we were going to press, made mincemeat of one sentence in the article by Major George Fielding Eliot in last week's issue of The New Republic. We hereby reprint that sentence and the preceding one:

"Another danger to sound military policy is the tendency now apparent to hook up the national-defense program with certain projects of social and internal reform, such as the rehabilitation of our railways, a power program, housing and even soil erosion. That improvements in these matters make an indirect contribution to national defense cannot of course be disputed; so do education, agricultural adjustment, sound financial policies and many other things—indeed, the argument can be made as to practically every department of governmental activity."

Contributors

FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN is professor of Political Science at Williams College. He is working on a diplomatic history of Europe since 1933 (Alfred A. Knopf).

D. H. PALMER is an engineer and physicist who was formerly head of the technical department of Consumers' Research, Inc., and is now technical supervisor of the Consumers' Union of the United States, Inc.

PHYLLIS BOTTOME's most recent novel is "The Mortal Storm." She has been in the United States for several months on a lecture tour.

HENRI LEFEBVRE's latest work is "Le Nationalisme Contre les Nations." He is living in France.

MAX LERNER's first book, "It Is Later Than You Think," was published last month by the Viking Press.

HARVEY J. BRESLER, a New York business man, was formerly an attorney in one of America's largest law firms. He has contributed articles to The Political Science Quarterly, The New Masses and The Foreign Policy Association Bulletin.

GRAND BALL & FESTIVAL
SUN., JAN. 1, 1939, IRVING PLAZA, 15th St. & Irving Pl.
Ida Soyers Dance Group — Film: One Hysterical Night
Wilbert Griffiths Harlem Swing Club
Refreshments — Games — Special Entertainment
TICKETS: 50c in advance — 75c at door
REMEMBER THE HOLIDAY ALL DAY MONDAY
Tickets at Workers Bookshop, 50 E. 13th St.

At World Famous WINTER GARDEN
B'way & 50th St.
Evgs. (8:30) $1 - $3
exc. Sat. & holidays
Mats. Wed. & Sat. $1 - $2
"Season's Unchallenged Smash Hit"—*N. Y. Times*
HELLZAPOPPIN
Cast of 100 — 50 Lovely Girls
"OLSEN & JOHNSON'S Uproarious Musical virtually rolls 'em in the aisles. The bigger they are the harder they laugh."—*NEWS*
Mats. Xmas Week: Dec. 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31.

FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY YEAR
WORKERS SCHOOL
Winter Term Registration
Courses in: Economics, Dialectical Materialism, Marxism-Leninism, Literature, American History, Labor History, Current Events, War in China and Its International Implications, Modern European History, Introduction to Philosophy, Psychology, and many others. For Descriptive Catalogue E, write to
35 EAST 12th ST., NEW YORK CITY, ALgonquin 4-1199

SOVIET PERIODICALS IN ENGLISH

MOSCOW NEWS—Illustrated weekly. 24 pages. "MOSCOW NEWS" contains, among features, weekly reviews of new plays, books and concerts; news and statistics in agriculture, industry and trade; notes in science, medicine, education. "MOSCOW NEWS" is an attractive, fast-selling publication.
1 yr. $2 6 mos. $1 single copy 5c

INTERNATIONAL LITERATURE—Illustrated monthly. Devoted to socialist culture in the USSR, to anti-fascist literature and art of all countries.
1 yr. $2.50 6 mos. $1.25 single copy 25c

SOVIETLAND—Illustrated monthly. Its highlights: How Socialism spurs initiative and enterprise—Soviet practice proving superiority of socialist system of economy. Culture, art, recreation and education of the broadest masses. Feature articles on different phases of Soviet life.
1 yr. $1.50 6 mos. 75c single copy 15c

USSR IN CONSTRUCTION—Richly illustrated monthly. The beautiful pictures show in a striking manner the socialist industry, the Sovkohzes and Kolkhozes, the general culture, the people of the Soviet Union and their everyday life.
1 yr. $3 6 mos. $1.50 single copy 25c

COMBINED SUBSCRIPTION RATES:
Moscow News and Sovietland..... $3.00
Moscow News and USSR in Construction.... 4.25
Moscow News and International Literature.. 3.75

Place Orders With:
BOOKNIGA CORPORATION
225 FIFTH AVENUE — NEW YORK, N. Y.
BOOKNIGA AGENCY, 69 Congress Street, Chicago, Illinois
MEZHDUNARODNAJA KNIGA, 18 Kuznetski Most, Moscow
Ask At All Newsstands — *Catalogues and Sample Copies Sent on Request*

Gala . . .
NEW YEAR'S EVE BALL
For the benefit of
POLITICAL REFUGEES FROM NAZI TERROR
Dancing: GEORGE OLSON *Society Orchestra*
Saturday, 10 P. M. DEC. 31, 1938
Admission: $1.50 *in advance* $2.00 *at door*
★ LUTHER ADLER ★ MORRIS CARNOVSKY ★ LEIF ERIKSON ★ KATHERINE LOCKE ★ RAYMOND MASSEY ★ BENNO SCHNEIDER and other stars of Radio, Stage and Screen.
Floor show and entertainment
Sponsored by: (partial list) Albert Einstein, Hon. Stanley Isaacs, Hon. Vito Marcantonio, Councilman Chas. Belous, Councilman Michael Quill, Paul Kern, Mag. Anna M. Kross, Helen Hayes, George C. Kaufman, Guthrie McClintic, Clifford Odets, Donald O. Stewart
HOTEL RIVERSIDE PLAZA
73rd St., West of B'way., N. Y. C.
Auspices: Non-Sectarian Committee for Political Refugees, I. L. D., 112 East 19th St., N. Y. C.

LECTURE
LUDWIG LORE, speaks on: **"CAN AMERICA STAY OUT?"** on Tues. Eve., Dec. 27, at 8:30 P. M. at 2 West 86th St. Refreshments-Dancing. Admission 50 cents. **THE GROUP FORUM.**

PERSONAL
YOUNG WOMAN, Hebrew, of esthetic artistic inclination, desires correspondence with those similarly inclined. Address: Box 111, The New Republic.

CHRISTMAS DINNER all alone? Come, make merry with festive get-together group now forming. Midtown Hotel — Lucretia Randolph, 505 Fifth Avenue, N. Y.

POSITIONS WANTED
YOUNG MAN, 35, American Jew, college graduate, research and business experience. Vocationally useful proficiencies include accounting, statistics, stenography. Willing and able to fill any administrative post (from office boy to executive) in social-minded organization. Box 112, The New Republic.

COLLEGE GRADUATE, gentleman, fine personality, single, 23, travel, invest money, now responsibly employed. Excellent cultural and business background. Desires career opportunity with intelligent individual or organization. Box 113, The New Republic.

FOR SALE
COMPLETE SET of New Republic, except 4 numbers, but "A Test of the News" is safely included. **Victor E. Helleberg, Lawrence, Texas.**

FOR RENT
WILL RENT reasonably to responsible party, Pennsylvania stone house, antique furniture, oil heat, fireplaces, 2 baths, pool, garages. Easy commutation. References. Owner going abroad. Harold A. VanKirk, 1 Oxford Road, Fallsington, Pa.

PAMPHLET
ASPECTS OF BIRTH CONTROL
by Morris Talpalar
Margaret Sanger says: " . . . you have covered the subject very clearly. . . ."
Pamphlet 25c
M. Talpalar, 226 West 4th Street, N. Y. C.

GRAMOPHONE RECORDS
MUSIC LOVERS 100,000 of the finest records in the world on sale at 50c and 75c per record (value $1.50 & $2.) The Syphonies, Chamber Music, Operas, etc., of Bach, Beethoven, Brahms, Mozart, Wagner, etc. Mail Orders. Catalog. The Gramophone Shop, Inc., 18 East 48th St., N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED